

- - - - -

*DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING*

Evening Session

Before Andrea L. Gregory, Certified Court Reporter

At the North Augusta Community Center

495 Brookside Avenue

North Augusta, South Carolina

On Thursday, February 15, 2007

- - - - -

---

---

***AUGUSTA WEST-CULPEPPER REPORTING***

***Certified Court Reporters***

***505 Courthouse Lane***

***Augusta, Georgia 30901***

***(706) 722-3746***

***1-800-592-3376 (Depo)***

INDEX TO PROCEEDING

	<u>Page</u>
OPENING BY MR. BROWN.....	3
STATEMENTS BY STATE and FEDERAL OFFICIALS.....	4 through 22
STATEMENTS BY PUBLIC and LOCAL OFFICIALS.....	23 through 115
CLOSING BY MR. BROWN.....	117
ADJOURNMENT.....	117
EXHIBITS .....	118 through 224
CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER.....	225

MR. BROWN: It's now time to receive your formal comments on the scope of the proposed PEIS. This is your opportunity to let DOE know about what you would like to see addressed in the draft document. The court reporter will transcribe your statement. Let me review a few ground rules for the formal comments. Please step up to the microphone over there when your name is called. Introduce yourself, providing an organizational affiliation where appropriate. If you have a written version of your statement please provide a copy to the court reporter after you've completed your remarks. I will call two names at a time, the first of the speaker and the second of the person to follow. This apparently is a very vocal crowd. Over ninety people have signed up to speak. And usually we--I try and do a little math here and figure out--even if y'all have 2 minutes each we're now looking at a ten o'clock ending so I will implore you to summarize your statement. I should remind you again that the comments have equal weight whether they're submitted by email, by fax, verbally or whatever. When they're being reviewed they all have equal weight. So if you can please summarize. I'm going to have to try and run a tight ship. I really do hate to cut off people or interrupt. So if you can discipline yourselves, as actually folks did at the last meeting I

ran here, I'd appreciate it. Mr. Black will be serving as the hearing officer for the Department of Energy during the formal comment period. Again, he will not be responding to any questions or comments. We will begin with representatives of federal and state elected officials, after which we will turn to members of the public.

So I will begin by asking Nancy Bobbitt to step forward, who will be representing several of our elected officials.

Hi, welcome back.

And--I'm sorry--our second person is Ian Headley.

MS. BOBBITT: Thank you and good evening. Tonight I'm representing Senator Johnny Isakson as well as Senator Saxby Chambliss. The letter is as follows.

To The Honorable Samuel Bodman, Mr. Secretary: We both understand how important electrical production from nuclear reactors has been to the energy supply in Georgia and South Carolina. Our country and the world will continue to require increasing supplies of energy.

And safe and affordable, environmentally friendly nuclear power will become increasingly important. For that reason the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership initiative is very promising by implementing nuclear fuel cycles which have greater production--protection against the proliferation of nuclear materials and

which reduce the amount and toxicity of long-lived nuclear waste. Successful deployment of your GNEP initiative will facilitate the increased worldwide use of nuclear power, an energy source which does not emit greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Two locations near the Central Savannah River Area of Georgia and South Carolina are being considered for the GNEP facilities, an energy park on the Savannah River Site and the South Carolina Applied Technology Park near Barnwell, South Carolina. Both of these locations have merit and have the ability to build upon the extensive nuclear capabilities which exist in our region. Our two-state combination of existing capabilities, ready markets for electricity produced and strong state and local support will result in time and cost savings in implementing the GNEP program. We look forward to working with you in turning this initiative into reality. Sincerely, Saxby Chambliss and Johnny Isakson, United States Senate.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. That's a very good precedent. Ian Headley, and Kathryn Wade will follow.

MR. HEADLEY: My name is Ian Headley. I'm a staff member from the office of United States Senator Jim DeMint. This is his statement.

The State of South Carolina has been a longtime partner with the Department of Energy in hosting a

range of nuclear missions and projects. With more than 50 years of experience, we are proud of the role South Carolina has played in serving our nation's interests.

While in Congress, I have come to appreciate the very extensive, strong, and unique relationship South Carolina has with DOE. The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership has the potential to overcome barriers to the expansion of nuclear power which is, in my view, critical to the energy security of the United States and the world. I believe this represents another opportunity for DOE to partner with South Carolina on a vital mission for our nation. At the same time, this is an opportunity for DOE to fulfill a promise and investment in South Carolina that was made in the 1970s. Therefore, I strongly support the efforts being made on behalf of the Savannah River Site and the South Carolina Advanced Technology Park near Barnwell. From my perspective, South Carolina must be considered for this opportunity, but as with any nuclear mission, support is dependent on: public acceptance; conclusive evidence of the scientific underpinnings of GNEP; proof of full compliance with federal and state environmental laws and regulations; assurance of continuing public health and safety; a full vetting of all aspects of spent nuclear fuel in GNEP facilities and disposition paths for all resulting nuclear waste; and

sustainability and legal enforceability of all agreements. I look forward to working with DOE to develop the GNEP program and ensure its success. With best regards, Jim DeMint, United States Senate.

MR. BROWN: All right. Thank you. Kathryn Wade. She will be followed by Lark Jones.

MS. WADE: Good evening. My name is Kathryn Wade. I'm a staff person for Congressman Gresham Barrett, Third Congressional District. I have a letter addressed to The Honorable Samuel W. Bodman.

Dear Secretary Bodman: The need for a safe, environmentally-friendly, and affordable source of energy in order to reduce our nation's dependency on foreign oil has never been greater. We very much appreciate the President's forward-looking approach for increasing U.S. energy security and reducing global nuclear proliferation through the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. As the Department of Energy prepares a Programmatic Environment Impact Statement for the GNEP initiative in the upcoming months, we strongly urge you to consider South Carolina as the possible location for any or all of the three GNEP facilities: the nuclear fuel recycling center, the advanced fuel reactor, and the advanced fuel cycle research facility.

As you are undoubtedly aware, for over 50 years the State of South Carolina has contributed to our

country's defense and energy programs through various important nuclear missions. Now, as we look to the future, we again anticipate the integral role our state can play in the expansion of clean nuclear power in order to meet U.S. and worldwide energy demands, to reduce the amount of nuclear waste, and to secure an independent energy future for our nation.

There are many advantages to locating the GNEP facilities at the proposed sites in South Carolina. The southeastern United States is at the forefront of the nuclear renaissance, and South Carolina is at the epicenter of the region. In our state alone, half of the electricity used is produced in nuclear power plants. This prime location will place the GNEP facilities in close proximity to its customer base and abundant regional markets that already exist for the electricity that would be produced by the advanced recycle reactor. Furthermore, the availability of a knowledgeable and dedicated nuclear operations workforce, trained security personnel, and an underlying nuclear infrastructure in the state will significantly reduce DOE's costs related to and the time needed to begin operation of the GNEP facilities.

Most importantly, broad and unparalleled support for DOE nuclear activities exists at all levels of government as well as from business and community



groups around the proposed sites in South Carolina.

As the Department of Energy continues to develop the Programmatic Environment Impact Statement for the GNEP, we ask that you please keep us informed of any developments and do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide additional details regarding this matter. The letter is signed: sincerely, J. Gresham Barrett and Joe Wilson, both members of Congress.

I also have a letter from Representative Bob Inglis. Dear Secretary Bodman: I congratulate you and the Department of Energy for aggressively pursuing a wide variety of clean and domestic sources for meeting our country's future energy needs. I particularly note your Global Nuclear Energy Partnership program to develop new, proliferation-resistant nuclear fuel cycles which have the added benefit of increasing the efficiency of nuclear fuel utilization and reducing nuclear waste. This is the type of program which can increase the worldwide standard of living in a safe and environmentally friendly manner.

I support the objectives of your GNEP initiative and recommend South Carolina as an ideal place to turn your vision into practice. Our state provides the markets, infrastructure, people and support which will be critically necessary for the timely and cost-effective commercial demonstration and private

sector adoption of these new fuel cycles into the marketplace.

South Carolina has a long history with nuclear programs. Over 60 percent of the electricity consumed in South Carolina is produced in nuclear plants. Two nuclear plants are being actively planned for construction in our state. There is a positive 55-year relationship with the Savannah River Site and our state was home to one of the commercial reprocessing facilities built in the 1970s. In addition, the SRS possesses DOE's most modern plutonium facilities and infrastructure, and its only workforce skilled in the processing and storage of production-scale quantities of plutonium. These advantages are of significant importance in assuring the success of all three GNEP facilities.

I appreciate the opportunity to support your Department in the GNEP initiative and look forward to helping you achieve our nation's goal of energy independence. Signed: sincerely, Bob Inglis, Member of Congress.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Lark Jones. Don Smith will be next, and if the next speaker could move to the front row that will save some time.

MR. JONES: Thank you. Mr. Black, other DOE staff members, we appreciate the opportunity to speak

tonight. I am Lark Jones; I'm the mayor of North Augusta. And I have a letter here from Senator Lindsey Graham that I would like to read. And, Mr. Black, I think you're going to see very quickly there's a pattern emerging of all of the federal elected officials in this area being very supportive of this concept. This letter is dated today, and it's addressed to Secretary Bodman.

In September I had the opportunity to convey my strong support for South Carolina's efforts to participate in the Department of Energy's Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. I was pleased that you chose both South Carolina bids for further study, and I want to reiterate my unqualified support for this program and the role that the Savannah River National Lab and the Barnwell facilities can play. In the months following my earlier letter I have been impressed by the continued expressions of support from the community for both the GNEP vision and the role that South Carolina can play. The success of this DOE initiative will surely be advanced by the expertise and experience currently in South Carolina. GNEP is a fundamental component of any effort to foster a robust nuclear renaissance. With the majority of operating nuclear reactors located east of the Mississippi River, South Carolina is well situated to be a major center of

nuclear spent fuel recycling. With reactors operating in South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia the region has a steady supply of spent nuclear fuel that can be used for a pilot project. This type of project will alleviate any need to create an interim storage facility. The residents of the surrounding community are excited about new opportunities to build upon the history and expertise of this region. I look forward to continuing our partnership in turning GNEP into a reality. Thank you for your continued consideration of these proposals. Sincerely, Lindsey O. Graham, United States Senator.

And I would like to add just a personal comment that I signed up to speak but in the interest of eliminating those ninety people I have submitted a letter which sort of echos Senator Graham's comments. And I can tell you from a local level as the mayor of this town, our local and surrounding communities are willing, ready, and able to do whatever we can to help solve the energy problems of this country. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: I believe your generous gesture has probably earned you a lot of votes. Thank you.

Mike Easterday will follow Don Smith.

MR. SMITH: Good evening. My name is Don Smith and I'm the State Representative here--South Carolina

State Representative from here in North Augusta. And I wanted to echo the mayor's comments from a personal standpoint. We have long had the facility out here at Savannah River Site where it's been a part of our heritage and we look forward to a very long and lasting continued relationship.

Here again, I may be holding two hats tonight. One is to respond for the Governor of the State of South Carolina, Mark Sanford. He's--regrets that he could not be here tonight, but he has a long history of supporting the Department of Energy and the Savannah River Site. And in an essence of time I'm just going to read a short excerpt from his letter, if I could.

For more than 50 years South Carolina has been an active partner with the Department of Energy at the Savannah River Site, hosting a wide range of nuclear missions. Due to that vast experience our citizens and communities are already well-prepared to meet the changing needs of national security and economic needs of our country. GNEP offers us another opportunity to work together in moving forward on safer and more cost-effective energy production. Given our strong history with nuclear programs, we believe South Carolina could once again provide a strong partner for the Department of Energy. One of the most interesting components of the GNEP proposal is the spent fuel

recycling program. As you know, South Carolina currently stores a significant amount of spent waste and therefore has the advantage of having feedstock for this facility already in place. Thank you in advance for your consideration of South Carolina as a potential GNEP site. We look forward to working with DOE and any contractors of this and other projects in the future. Sincerely, Mark Sanford, Governor, State of South Carolina.

And secondly I'm here as a representative of the legislative delegation of the Aiken County Delegation in Columbia. We have a letter here and, here again, in the essence of time I'm just going to read the last two paragraphs of that.

The members of the Aiken County Legislative Delegation support the GNEP initiative for Aiken County and this region. We are comfortable with the safe, clean processing of this fuel in our state and our community. We fully support the State of South Carolina's position that nuclear waste products brought into South Carolina for processing purposes with an approved pathway to out-of-state storage is the correct approach. The Aiken County Legislative Delegation has a long history of support of the Savannah River Site and its missions. We believe that the GNEP initiative at the Savannah River Site is in the best interest of

this nation, this state and our community. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Mike Easterday and Eddie Butler will follow.

MR. EASTERDAY: Good evening. I'm Mike Easterday. I'm Lieutenant Governor Andre Bauer's chief of staff and legal counsel. He regrets due to his prior commitment he could not be here. And I'll submit a letter on his behalf.

As Lieutenant Governor of the State of South Carolina, I respectfully request that the Department of Energy give strong consideration to our state as the location for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership program and facilities. In addition to DOE's Savannah River Site, South Carolina is home to the only commercial site which was constructed in the past to fulfill one of the missions associated with GNEP. Not only does South Carolina have the physical infrastructure in place to sustain a project of this magnitude, our local and statewide elected officials will provide a network of support in both the startup and operation of this important international project. Most importantly, the people of South Carolina have a long history of supporting energy and defense-related industry. Our citizens represent a dedicated, skilled workforce familiar with and appreciative of the missions of the Department of Energy. We are equipped

to employ all of the resources necessary, from our colleges and technical schools to our workforce development network, to make the GNEP program both successful and enviable to the international community.

In short, we are proud of the role our state has played in the missions of the Department of Energy throughout history, and we believe no other state is more qualified to implement the programs of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. Please accept this statement of support as my full commitment of the GNEP program and my pledge of assistance to this project.  
Andre Bauer, Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Eddie Butler, and Chris Wilson will be next.

MR. BUTLER: Good evening. I'm Eddie Butler. I'm here tonight to speak on behalf of Senator Greg Ryberg and the State of South Carolina, the State Senate, as well as Aiken County Council and Greater Aiken Chamber of Commerce. All three come with the same message, our support for GNEP.

Senator Ryberg says that: I congratulate you and the Department of Energy for aggressively pursuing a wide variety of clean and domestic sources for meeting our country's future energy needs. I particularly note your Global Nuclear Energy Partnership program to develop new, proliferation-resistant nuclear fuel



cycles which have the added benefit of increasing the efficiency of nuclear fuel utilization and reducing nuclear waste. This is the type of program which can increase the worldwide standard of living in a safe and environmentally friendly manner. I support the objectives of your GNEP initiative and recommend South Carolina as an ideal place to turn your vision into practice. Our state provides the markets, infrastructure, people and support which will be critically necessary for the timely and cost-effective commercial demonstration and private sector adoption of these new fuel cycles into the marketplace. South Carolina has a long history with nuclear programs. Over 60 percent of the electricity consumed in South Carolina is produced in nuclear plants. Two new nuclear plants are being actively planned for construction in our state. There is a positive 55-year relationship with the Savannah River Site and our state was home to one of the plutonium facilities and infrastructure and its only workforce skilled in processing and storage of production-scale quantities of plutonium. These advantages are of significant importance in assuring the success of all three GNEP facilities. I appreciate the opportunity to support your Department in the GNEP initiative.

As far as Aiken County, if I can read the last

paragraph. Aiken County has a long history of support of the Savannah River Site and its missions. We believe that the GNEP initiative at the Savannah River Site is in the best interest of this nation, this state and our community. And it's signed unanimously by all members of council.

And I also have a letter I'd like to enter into the record from the Chamber. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much. Chris Wilson and Representative Lonnie Hosey will follow.

MR. WILSON: Good evening. My name is Chris Wilson. I am a member of the Bamberg County Council. But right now it's my job and my pleasure to speak to you on behalf of Senator Brad Hutto, State Senator of South Carolina. He could not be here tonight but wanted to make sure that the voice of the people of Allendale, Bamberg, Barnwell, and Orangeburg Counties could be heard this evening. I'm going to read a letter from him.

As State Senator for District 40, I speak for the citizens of four counties when I request that the Department of Energy bestow full consideration to selecting South Carolina as the site for the GNEP program's facilities. With both the Savannah River Site and an available nuclear fuel reprocessing facility on adjoining property, the proposed South

Carolina site is a perfect fit for this project. IN fact, the selection of South Carolina for the GNEP mission could save millions of taxpayer dollars while utilizing a former facility constructed for reprocessing nuclear fuel. In addition, the people of South Carolina have a long and proud history of working on DOE missions and for the nuclear industry, which has created a skilled workforce prepared to handle the security and technological demands of the GNEP project.

Our citizens are not only accomplished and capable in the nuclear industrial field; we are grateful for the job creation and enthusiastic for the opportunity to be part of a program with international impact for generations to come. Furthermore, as the senator representing the people of District 40, the economic impact that the GNEP project would bring to this rural region of South Carolina would have more relevance to the future of our citizenship than possibly any other in the United States. I urge the Department of Energy to select South Carolina for the GNEP project.

Sincerely, Brad Hutto, South Carolina Senate.

And just in--as a matter of in the interest of time, I would like to say as a Bamberg County Council citizen and a Bamberg County Council member I'd like to voice my support and the support of my county for the GNEP program and the siting of the facilities here in

South Carolina. We are eager to have South Carolina selected for the project and I believe it's a project that the citizens of this state and this area would proudly accept and proudly operate. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Representative Hosey to be followed by Representative Bill Clyburn.

MR. HOSEY: I'm Lonnie Hosey. And on behalf of the people of Allendale and Barnwell Counties, House District 91, whom I serve as their representative in the South Carolina House, I'm here tonight to voice our full support of GNEP project and to request that the Department of Energy give highest consideration to South Carolina as the site for the proposed GNEP facility. For over 50 years, as you've heard tonight, the people of our region have supported energy and defense-related missions and we have served those missions well. There is no community more suited or skilled to handle the GNEP project for the Department of Energy. In short, the selection of this proposed site for the GNEP program would best serve not only the people of our area who have dedicated their community and workforce to the missions of DOE. The selection of this proposed site would also best serve the people of our country, who deserve no less than the wisest use of their tax dollars. And the nuclear infrastructure and

community in place would save millions over construction of an entirely new facility at another site. Clearly, the people of Barnwell County and surrounding areas have both the facility and workforce in place to implement the GNEP program expeditiously and efficiently. Furthermore, I declare that there is no community anywhere else in this country more supportive of our nuclear missions than our community.

We welcome the GNEP program to our area and we stand united in urging the Department of Energy to select the community for the site of the nuclear reprocessing facility. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. And Representative Bill Clyburn.

MR. CLYBURN: Thank you, Mr. Black. I'm going to be brief, too. I will submit a very long letter to the recorder. I--my name is Bill Clyburn and I am a member of South Carolina General Assembly and I am also a member of our Aiken County Delegation. And I want to echo, too, that I am very supportive of this project and I want to express my support for the site at the Savannah River for the proposed nuclear fuel recycling center and the advanced recycling reactor being proposed for the GNEP facilities. I, too, want to see new jobs and want our tax base improved and broadened, and we do respect the nuclear plant--nuclear site being

responsible for more than a half of our electricity here in South Carolina. It's just a win-win situation for Aiken and for the city of Aiken, for the county, for South Carolina and this--it's just an overall winner for all of us. And I certainly hope that the Secretary of Energy will truly consider that the GNEP facility be brought here at the Savannah River Site. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. That concludes presentations by state and federal elected officials. At this point I would begin calling members of the public. And we will be alternating between members of the public and local elected officials. I'd like to begin with a member of the public who is very dedicated, who apparently has a wedding anniversary for this evening. So he's number one and was anxious to go, so if Gary Perez is--

MR. PEREZ: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: You're welcome.

MR. PEREZ: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Gary Perez and I am an employee at Savannah River Site. I'm here tonight to read a letter addressed to The Honorable Samuel Bodman, Secretary of Energy from the Washington Savannah River Company Diversity Board of Directors expressing their support for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

Dear Secretary Bodman: The Washington Savannah River Company Diversity Board of Directors is writing in support of locating the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership here at Savannah River Site. There are several reasons we feel SRS would be an excellent location for the GNEP. They include: demonstrating a strong commitment to diversity and teamwork; cultivating a large, diverse, experienced workforce with a notable safety and security record; exhibiting extensive experience with safe reactor operations; and providing cutting edge technology solutions both at SRS and abroad at Savannah River National Laboratory. WSRC recognizes diversity and teamwork as crucial components of the organization's strategic business outlook and as such the WSRC Diversity Board of Directors was created in 1997 to ensure that we continue to maximize the potential of all of our human resources at SRS. The WSRC company president sponsors our mission and routinely removes barriers as needed in support of actions the DBOD deems necessary. We certainly believe that this commitment to the people that make up the SRS gives us the competitive edge and a sustainable competitive advantage. At WSRC, we recognize that our people are our most valuable resource, and the WSRC Diversity Board of Directors fully supports and endorses the Savannah River Site as the location for

the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. The WSRC DBOD is comfortable with the safe, clean processing of this fuel in our state and our community and fully supports the State of South Carolina's position that nuclear waste products brought into South Carolina for processing purposes with an approved pathway to out-of-state storage is the correct approach. And it's signed by the members of the 2006-2007 members of the Diversity Board.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. I wasn't going to let you run over time.

MR. PEREZ: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Next is Ronnie Young to be followed by Bill Bassham. And if the next speaker can come up to the very front row that'll save some time. Thanks.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you. I have a letter of support from--for the DOE program and support for the location of the GNEP facilities in South Carolina from myself and three of my local counterparts in the area, being Mr. Deke Copenhaver, Mayor of Augusta; Chairman Ron Cross of the Columbia County Commission; and Chairman Monroe Kneece of Edgefield County Council.

We, collectively, represent about 500,000 citizens in the surrounding Central Savannah River Area. And we fully support South Carolina as the site for the GNEP facilities and we support the Savannah River Site also



for that endeavor. There are many advantages to Georgia and South Carolina by locating the facilities in South Carolina. The economic benefits are large with the tremendous investment in new construction and several thousand new needed jobs. Much investment could ultimately be on the tax roles. The advanced fuel cycle research facility provides a major new long-term mission for the Savannah River National Laboratory. Over one half of South Carolina's electricity is produced in nuclear plants. GNEP will help assure a reliable, environmentally friendly and economic source of energy and provide a better method of managing spent nuclear fuel in our state reactors. One of the region's most important principles for SRS and its activities is that any nuclear waste brought into South Carolina for processing have an approved pathway out of South Carolina. The GNEP program meets that objective. This is ample basis for a binding agreement with DOE on this matter which protects South Carolina's and the region's interest against unwarranted accumulation of spent nuclear fuel.

MR. BROWN: You're right at the 2-minute mark now if you can--you're right at 2 minutes if you can give us a summary.

MR. YOUNG: I'll summarize it. Thank you for your favorable consideration of the Savannah River Site as

your preferred site for the GNEP.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Bill Bassham, and Art Williams will be next.

MR. BASSHAM: My name is Bill Bassham. I'm the president of the North Augusta Chamber of Commerce and in that capacity represent about five hundred businesses in our community. I, too, am just going to pass on a letter of support and just want to make a couple of comments. One is that we have reviewed the goals of the Nuclear Energy Partnership and concur with these goals. The Chamber and the citizens of Aiken County would like to go on record as saying that we endorse GNEP's initiative and that we feel like the state of South Carolina would be the best place for that initiative to occur.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Art Williams, and Joe Whetstone will be next.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening. As County Administrator, it is my pleasure to speak tonight on behalf of Allendale County Council and the citizens of Allendale County who welcome the Global Nuclear Energy program to our communities. With a reprocessing facility already constructed in the region, a workforce ready and willing to operate the GNEP facility already living in the surrounding area, and community leaders who not only welcome the project but advocate it

throughout the four-county area, I am certain the Department of Energy could not ask for a more cost-effective location for the GNEP project. Moreover, with the record our community has in working on DOE missions and the experience our workforce offers, we can proudly say that our site would be not only a safe and efficient facility but one the world will point to as an example of innovation and a model of efficiency. We have a nuclear community with a proud tradition of fulfilling our country's defense missions, and now we ask for the opportunity to use the experience for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. We hope that you will consider South Carolina as the best location for the mission. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Joe Whetstone--

MR. WILLIAMS: And I submit something for the record.

MR. BROWN: --and Dorothy Tatum will follow.

MR. WHETSTONE: My name is Joe Whetstone. I live in Beaufort County, South Carolina, in the town of Bluffton. We get our water from the Savannah River, downstream. We have about 500 picocuries per year of tritium in our drinking water, far too much. We don't need any more of this happening here in this area because I'm afraid of the repercussions to we downstreamers. Yes, we have seven reactors in the

state. We're number three in the nation for the number of reactors. How does that affect our wonderful economy here? I certainly don't think that our GEP is number three in the nation or our income level compared to other states. Thank you for your time.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Dorothy Tatum, and Glenn Carroll is next.

MS. TATUM: I am Chairman of Bamberg County Council and, as Chairperson of Bamberg County, it is my honor tonight to share with you the support of the GNEP project and the desire of the citizens of Bamberg County to bring this project to our community. The people of Bamberg County have not only supported the missions brought to this part of South Carolina by DOE, we have benefitted from them. For years the jobs created by the DOE site have brought professionals into our community to live and work while helping keep our strongest and brightest in our community to fill the missions at SRS. During this time we have cultivated generations of families in the region of South Carolina who do not only understand the need for safe, clean energy through nuclear reprocessing, we embrace it. Even more importantly, our workforce is qualified and we have the experience and skills needed to facilitate this magnitude. The Department of Energy could not be better served by another community, nor could DOE make

a bigger impact on another economy than it would make by the selection of our proposed site in South Carolina. I urge you to select South Carolina for this project, and the people of Bamberg County welcome the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership with open arms.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Glenn Carroll and Keith Sloan will be next.

MS. CARROLL: Good evening. I'm representing Nuclear Watch South. GNEP is an unbelievably pie-in-the-sky boondoggle that will take \$100 billion and 50 years to unfold. It is unlikely that this will be sustained continuously by Congress. What is being offered under GNEP initially is nothing more than what is happening at reactor sites around the country now, and that is storing fuel in either fuel pools or in dry cask storage. There are no details. These details I'm giving you are from National Academy of Sciences studies from DOE figures. But in this GNEP thing the devil is in the lack of details. And South Carolinians should be aware that this babbling boondoggle could very well leave the nation's nuclear waste sitting in the Savannah River watershed. So be careful what you ask for. Nevada has put the entire resources of its state behind keeping this waste out of Nevada. And because they succeeded now South Carolina is coming up and saying bring it here? Think. We already have 35

million gallons of high-level waste and we don't know what to do with it. GNEP would produce phenomenally more of this same waste, liquid waste. In what tanks?

I don't know. Looks like it would be sitting on a parking lot. I hope you can read between the lines since we have 2 minutes, but I hope you will analyze all these things I'm referring to. Right now there's a socioeconomic thing to look at right--look at. Right now the way nuclear waste is handled is the utility charges rates. The rates get--some of it gets put in a fund and this fund gets given to DOE and DOE is supposedly going to take care of the waste. But that's right, they are not taking it to Nevada. Now we're talking about taxpayers shouldering some \$100 billion boondoggle. So you've got to analyze shifting this burden from taxpayers--from rate payers to taxpayers. There's a socioeconomic impact there.

MR. BROWN: And you're also at 2 minutes. If you have a dramatic summary--

MS. CARROLL: Well, this is one thing that we can insist that the EIS analyze: a direct hit from a jumbo jetliner to the parking lot of the nation's nuclear waste in the Savannah River watershed. And thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MS. CARROLL: We'll submit written comments.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Keith Sloan, and Chuck Goergen

will be next.

MR. SLOAN: Good evening. My name is Keith Sloan. I'm Chairman of Barnwell County Council, and I've got a frog in my throat so I'm going to try to read through this if you'd bear with me.

I'm here on behalf of the citizens of Barnwell County and speak with the full concurrence of Barnwell County Council in support of the GNEP program and the location of the program's nuclear reprocessing facility in our community. The people of Barnwell County have long been supportive of the nuclear industry. Through its commitment of more than 60 percent of the land area of the Savannah River Plant in the early 1950s to support the defense missions undertaken at the Savannah River Site, to later missions involving nuclear research, development of waste handling technologies and techniques and, in the late 1960s/early 1970s the construction of a privately owned nuclear fuel reprocessing facility near the Barnwell County town of Snelling, Barnwell County has demonstrated a high level of community support for the nuclear industry. From the grassroots level in our individual communities to our elected officials at the local, state and federal levels, our region has consistently supported the nuclear industry and DOE initiatives at SRS. The

people of our region are very knowledgeable of the nuclear industry and fully understand the importance of nuclear energy in reducing the country's dependence on foreign oil imports, strengthening of our national security and the development of even more advanced technologies to reduce nuclear waste and make handling and storage of nuclear waste material safer and more secure for the generations to come. The citizens of our region know that a nuclear fuel recycling facility can be built and operated in a safe and environmentally friendly manner in a community that is accustomed to the nuclear industry. We have the human and infrastructure resources in place to accommodate such an undertaking and, in fact, would view the facility siting in our region as the fulfillment of a promise made more than three decades ago. Because of this country's constantly growing dependence on foreign powers for crude oil and the precarious position this dependence places our economy, way of life and now, the very survival of our country at risk, the absolute necessity of a rapid and pervasive development of energy resources utilizing nuclear power is clear for all to see. However, development of energy resources from nuclear power must be accomplished--or accompanied--I'm sorry--by a concurrent development of nuclear fuel recycling capabilities.



MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. You're at 2 minutes if you can wrap up.

MR. SLOAN: I can do that. With our proximity to the Savannah River Site, technically trained and highly competent human resources and a nuclear reprocessing facility already erected here, the citizens of Barnwell County stand united with other South Carolinians in respectfully asking the Department of Energy to maximize the use of our U.S. tax dollars, do what is best for our national security while keeping a promise made to the people of Barnwell County more than three decades ago, by siting the GNEP nuclear reprocessing facility in South Carolina. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Chuck Goergen, and Carl Gooding next.

MR. GOERGEN: I am speaking as a concerned public citizen. The GNEP is a concept that I find sound and forward looking. I see it as a way to have peace for the future rather than potential fighting over shrinking reserves of energy sources. Issues I consider important for DOE to consider in alternative technology analyses are: greenhouse gases generated by each alternative technology and its contribution to global warming should be a key comparison point. Think globally; act locally. Thinking globally about energy

consumption and projected needs should bring major questions as to how we will meet that future demand. We in the U.S. consume a large per capita amount of energy, although not the largest. There is a close relationship between improved standards of living and energy consumption. There are billions of people throughout the world who are envious and want the same standard of living we enjoy in the U.S. Where will that energy supply come from? Increase use of coal, gas, and oil will increase carbon dioxide emissions and deplete the precious resources earlier because they are not limitless. Solar and wind power will never be able to reliably provide the demand in a cost-effective manner. Fusion is a long way off. I think nuclear is the only way to bridge the gap. It provides 20 percent of our power now. It is technology that does not produce copious amounts of carbon dioxide. While nuclear nonproliferation is important, I don't think it should drive selection or negation of a process or technology. There is an excellent record of secure processing and storage of fissile material. If we can guard it--if we guard gold in Fort Knox, we can guard plutonium. It is currently being done and can be improved. Maximizing the energy value in plutonium and treating it as an asset should be a goal. Issues I consider--

MR. BROWN: You're at 2 minutes now.

MR. GOERGEN: Okay. I'll just summarize. I urge our country to aggressively pursue this initiative in a nonpartisan manner. There must be a long-term vision and commitment. Without it our G5 partners will doubt our resolve, lose confidence in our leadership, and pursue their own course of action. The world will march on with clean, nuclear power whether our nation is on board or not.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Carl Gooding, and Scott MacGregor will be next.

MR. GOODING: Thank you very much. My name is Carl Gooding. I live in Allendale County. I'm a County Councilperson and I'm also Chairman of the Southern Carolina Alliance representing Allendale, Hampton, Barnwell and Bamberg County, and we support the reprocessing of nuclear fuels and the GNEP program.

Most of us have lived within a few miles of the Savannah River Site all our lives without fear for your family or yourself. I have friends and family that work at SRS and at nuclear power plants within the state. The nuclear industry is the most highly regulated industry in the world and one of the safest.

Reprocessing nuclear fuels to reduce the amount of waste materials, improve the efficiency of nuclear power, and contribute significantly to energy

independence makes good sense. France, Belgium England, Russia and other countries have reprocessed nuclear materials for decades without major accidents.

And according to things that I've picked up on the Internet there's never been a death resulting from a nuclear accident in the United States of America. On the average more than 33 people are killed annually by the fossil fuel industry, the mining industry. Generating electricity from nuclear fuel is safe, cost-effective, and reliable. Other nations have reprocessed spent fuel safely and efficiently for years. We should, too. This are is uniquely suited for reprocessing. We already have storage facilities, we have experienced scientists and engineers, the process knowhow, and we have a supportive community. So why not? It makes good sense, including dollars and cents. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Scott MacGregor, and Fred Cavanaugh is next.

MR. MACGREGOR: I'm Scott MacGregor. I'm here representing the Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce. The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership has the goal of creating a safe, environmentally friendly fuel cycle for our energy needs. The Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce believes that this effort is worthy of our support. We face many challenges in our future, and

GNEP is a thoughtful response to concerns about energy independence, nuclear proliferation and environmental impacts. The increased use of nuclear energy is essential to meet future needs. By pursuing the reuse of fuel for the nuclear energy process we can achieve our requirements while reducing the impact of waste on the environment and minimizing risks of material loss.

Metro Augusta has long been the home to many essential nuclear activities, and our residents are confident in the safety of such processes. The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership is the type of forward-thinking, solution-oriented project that the Augusta area has been proud to host in the past. Our community is honored to be a critical piece of our nation's energy puzzle. The Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce supports the development of the GNEP concept and its location in our community. Together we can meet the needs of the future. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Fred Cavanaugh is next and Susan Woods will follow.

MR. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Fred Cavanaugh, Mayor of the City of Aiken, and I'm here to read less than half of what I have here. I'll pick and choose a little bit.

The Aiken City Council believes that in order for us to become less dependent on foreign energy sources

we must accelerate our commercial nuclear energy programs. The citizens of Aiken and the Aiken County Council support GNEP initiative for our community and this region. Aiken City Council feels this is a win-win for our community and our country. Aiken City Council is comfortable with the safe, clean processing of this fuel in our state and our community. One of the region's important principles for SRS activities is that any nuclear waste brought into South Carolina for processing have an approved pathway out of South Carolina. The GNEP program meets this objective. This is ample basis for a binding agreement with DOE on the matter which protects South Carolina's and the region's interest against unwarranted accumulation of spent fuel.

I have a letter of support here from our entire City Council which is signed by our entire City Council as support and I'm saying also here the citizens of Aiken have a long history, as has been mentioned many times, of support for the Savannah River Site. And we believe that the GNEP initiative is best suited for the Savannah River Site and for the best interests of our nation, and our state and our community. Thank you, sir.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Susan Wood and K. Todd Etheredge will follow.

DR. WOOD: I am Dr. Susan Wood, Board Chairperson for Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness, the CNTA. I was previously Director of the Savannah River Technology Center, which is now the Savannah River National Laboratory. It is our firm believe that GNEP is essential to the worldwide growth of clean, safe and efficient nuclear power. And we are quite sure that our area is by far the best place in the country to locate these facilities. From a technical and scientific standpoint, the GNEP and our facilities at SRS and Barnwell can integrate perfectly. SRNL has a long and successful history of doing similar research and can thus provide the same expertise for GNEP. The laboratory can also ably provide nuclear physics support for the reactor design and operation. And SRNL has led the world in developing recycling technology, including the fundamental chemistry and equipment such as centrifugal contactors. Much of the expertise is still available and can be applied immediately to the GNEP programs. There are five universities in the area that stand ready to participate in research and training of technical experts, namely the Georgia Institute of Technology, Francis Marion, Clemson, The University of South Carolina, and South Carolina State University. Aiken Technical College is prepared to initiate education programs for lab technicians, health

physics inspectors, and certified welders and electricians. In addition, plans are underway to create a teaching and research reactor, SUNRISE, on the Savannah River Site. These plans have been developed by a team of twenty universities from all over the Southeast. The technical support is here. The infrastructure is here. The community support is here. Where else can that be found? Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Mayor Etheredge will be followed by Sara Barczak.

MR. ETHEREDGE: Thank you. I'd like to thank DOE for this opportunity and this forum tonight. I am Mayor Todd Etheredge of Jackson, South Carolina. For those that are unaware where Jackson is, we are located probably the closest community to the Savannah River Site and we certainly have a lot at stake here. I will summarize my letter. The Town of Jackson has a long history of support of the Savannah River Site and its missions. We believe that the GNEP initiative at the Savannah River Site is in the best interests of this nation, this state and our community. We anticipate your favorable consideration as the Savannah River Site for the proposed site for the GNEP facilities. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Sara Barczak followed by E.A. Stevenson.



MS. BARCZAK: My name is Sara Barczak and I live in the beautiful, historic city of Savannah, Georgia, which lies downstream from the Savannah River Site and Barnwell nuclear dump. I am also the Safe Energy Director for Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, a regional nonprofit with members throughout the Southeast, including Tennessee and South Carolina where reprocessing is being proposed. Southern Alliance for Clean Energy would like to make it clear from the outset that we strongly oppose the reprocessing of nuclear fuel and the overall GNEP for a variety of reasons: it's expensive and experimental; poses health risks; will increase the volumes of hazardous, radioactive waste at locations such as SRS, Oak Ridge, and Barnwell that are already plagued by enormous quantities of this waste and previous contamination; and it raises concerns over government subsidies unfairly favoring a destructive type of energy production over clean, safe energy alternatives. We believe that the DOE has only one option: to abandon the reprocessing initiative and put more money into the necessary cleanup at these sites. Nuclear reprocessing is targeting the Southeast as the nation's dumping ground for nuclear waste. SRS wins the gold medal for having the most amount of radioactivity at any DOE site in the nation, and our future--our region's future is

less than encouraging. We don't want any community to win gold medals for being the nation's nuclear waste dumping ground. The DOE should study how this entire region will be burdened even further by reprocessing. The DOE needs to know that water resources are limited and debates on how this precious resource should be protected is under heated debate currently in Georgia, South Carolina and elsewhere. The Savannah River, for instance, may have already surpassed its assimilative capacity ability. Currently SRS requires enormous amounts of surface and ground water, in the tens of billions of gallons per day, just to support currently established operations. The DOE must determine what additional water use will be required and what additional water contamination would be generated by reprocessing over its entire operating life versus the proposed no action alternative and put this in the context of every other need that the Savannah River is required for, both in Georgia and South Carolina. It is not fair to take water away from its highest and best use, which is for human consumption, in order to make profits for corporations while increasing contamination and tipping the scales towards further nuclear proliferation. The issue of environmental justice needs to be thoroughly studied given the demographics of the region, and also we request because

of the transportation that's going to be required of this waste at existing nuclear sites including traffic through our ports such as the ports of Charleston and Savannah, that environmental justice be studied along those corridors.

MR. BROWN: Okay. I'm sorry. You're at--

MS. BARCZAK: I'm sorry. I'm not stopping.

I--I--

MR. BROWN: Well, ma'am--

MS. BARCZAK: I have 3 minutes. I wrote this and it took 3 minutes and I've cut enough of it out and I drove 3 and a half hours to get here.

MR. BROWN: Please, if you could just summarize.

MS. BARCZAK: I am summarizing. I am summarizing.

We are also concerned about general emergency preparedness of communities living near these proposed sites and request the DOE to study these procedures. We would like the DOE--excuse me. We would like the DOE to be aware that in October 2006 we were denied access to the Economic Development Partnership of Aiken and Edgefield Counties' application for this project to import nuclear waste into the community after sending them a request in September. We are submitting our original request and their attorney's response. In our comments we request the DOE to share this information in the PEIS. Lastly, it is unfair to hold public

scoping meetings only in the locations where these facilities may be located. Communities such as Savannah, among many, many others, stand to lose dearly if reprocessing goes forward. The DOE should hold more meetings throughout the nation so the concerns of more Americans can be heard. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: E.A. Stevenson and Bob Alvarez will be next.

MR. STEVENSON: Good evening. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm Ned Stevenson. I'm Mayor of the Town of Allendale. On behalf of the Town of Allendale and the citizens of the city of Allendale I'm here tonight to express our community's support of the GNEP project and its location of a nuclear reprocessing facility here in South Carolina. For more than 50 years our citizens have supported and valued the Department of Energy's missions and the economic impact of the nuclear industry in our state. Today we welcome and need this project more than ever to offset the downsizing of SRS and its impact on our economy. We welcome the job creation from the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership program and we look forward to the revenue the facility will bring to our local economy. The Department of Energy will find no community more welcoming than ours for this project and we urge you to give South Carolina your highest consideration. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Bob Alvarez and Moses Cohen will follow.

MR. ALVAREZ: Good evening and thank you for allowing me this free time. Since there remain major uncertainties about the technologies of the GNEP plan I'd just like to go over a couple of issues. One is pertaining to cost. The cost associated with the major elements of the GNEP program were first requested or done at the request of the Department of Energy in 1996 for the top energy engineers and scientists at the National Academy of Sciences. The National Academy panel concluded a very lengthy report which looked at both technological viability and the economic viability of what the elements of units were. They concluded that the plan envisioned under GNEP would cost some \$500 billion and require 150 years to accomplish the transmutation. Capital and operating costs of a reprocessing plant in the United States, according to the Academy, would range from 50 to \$130 billion. The National Academy panel also concluded that this is a program that was uneconomical and would require a federal subsidy between 30 and 100 billion. The Department of Energy has offered nothing to reconcile GNEP to the cost estimates provided by the National Academy. They've provided no plan estimates. In terms

of costs associated with it I think it's fair to look at how the Department is currently managing defense high-level waste which also resulted from reprocessing.

Currently the cost for defense high-level radioactive waste from production reactors at Savannah River, Hanford, and also at--reprocessing at the Idaho Laboratory is estimated to cost by the Energy Department in excess of \$100 billion. And, as you know, Savannah River stores about 34 million gallons of these wastes in forty-nine large underground tanks that contain about 70 percent of the total radioactivity in all of the Department of Energy's defense waste. After spending more than 20 years and millions of dollars, however, DOE has processed less than 3 percent of the radioactivity in SRS high-level waste tanks and about 0.1 percent in all DOE high-level waste tanks. Now, the current amount of high-level radioactive waste in the DOE complex pales in comparison with the waste that would be handled and disposed in the GNEP program. Based on the Department's--well, first of all, their spent fuel, the--

MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. You're getting close to 2 minutes.

MR. ALVAREZ: Okay. Okay. Last year the Energy and Water Appropriations Committee basically pointed out that the first test of any site's willingness to

host a facility such as a reprocessing plant is its willingness to receive into interim storage spent fuel in dry casks and provide safe storage of spent fuel for 50 to 100 years or longer. A reprocessing plant of the scale envisioned under GNEP would store approximately ten to 20,000 metric tons of spent fuel at a given time, which would be about 1,000 to 2,000 casks. The amount of radioactivity that would be processed at a recycling plant--we've looked at the Department of Energy's radioactive inventory data relative to spent fuel--would be somewhere between 11 and 19.4 billion curies, which is six to eleven times more radioactivity than currently stored at the Savannah River Site. Accepting the Department's assertion that 99 percent of the transuranic waste would be recovered, which is a fairly good thing if they're able to do this, this would be about fourteen to twenty-four times more radioactivity than all transuranic waste currently in--at all DOE sites.

MR. BROWN: If you can just--

MR. ALVAREZ: I certainly will. I will try.

Thank you very much. I will. Thank you. Finally, I think the major issue is the separation of about 7 to 12 billion curies of cesium and strontium-90 for what is called decay storage or disposal over a 300-year period. This--in other words, they're taking out the

hottest, most radioactive waste and parking it on the surface forever. I'm not sure if the community at Savannah River would--or the communities surrounding Savannah River would be willing to accept this. No nation has ever done anything like this before. The current reprocessing plants do not separate large amounts of radio-caesium for permanent surface storage and disposal. They put--place them in logs designated for geological disposal. This is something you need to keep in mind.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MR. ALVAREZ: Finally--

MR. BROWN: This is your conclusion. This if your final final.

MR. ALVAREZ: This is my final final.

MR. BROWN: Right.

MR. ALVAREZ: The amount of radioactive waste generated at a large civilian spent fuel reprocessing plant in the United States is unprecedented. In particular the GNEP plan to separate billions of curies of cesium and strontium could result in cracks in surface storage of some of the largest, most lethal accumulations of radioactive waste in the world. Assuming near perfection in recoverability the magnitude of radioactive waste released into the environment could exceed that from 50 years of nuclear



weapons production, at all DOE sites, by the way. If the DOE's record addressing waste in the Cold War the promise of GNEP does not inspire confidence. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: And we're going to make you stay to the end of the meeting. Moses Cohen followed by Robin White.

MR. COHEN: Good evening. My name is Moses Cohen. I'm the Mayor of the Town of Fairfax in Allendale County. I am here to support GNEP on behalf of our community. For more than 50 years our citizens have supported and valued the Department of Energy missions and the of the nuclear industry in our state. Today we welcome and need this project more than ever to offset the downsizing of Savannah River Site and its impact on our economy. We welcome the jobs creation from the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership program and we looking forward to the revenue and the facilities will bring to our local economy. The Department of Energy will find no community more welcoming than ours for this project, and we urge to give South Carolina your highest consideration. And we have a team of approximately thirty or forty people to support this from Allendale County. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Robin White and Buddy Sandifer will be next.

MR. WHITE: My name is Robin White. I'm speaking on behalf of myself. The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership takes the parts of a clean energy production process and combines them into a logically coordinated effective method of producing significant quantities of energy that can be used to drive the economic engine of the future. We need to work globally on this process and as a leading energy user of the world we need to take positive quantifiable steps to lead the way and demonstrate our commitment to restoring a global balance. It will take large quantities of energy to produce sufficient quantities of hydrogen, ethanol, and electricity for use by the world's populations. Renewables and energy efficient products by their nature play an important part in the process at the local level. The use of nuclear power as the base load driver of the industrial economy will work in concert with renewables and energy efficient products to turn the present course of greenhouse gas production. The new generation of reactors will be built mainly in the Southeast to support the move of population and industry. Therefore, it makes sense to put a GNEP center in the same geographic area. The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership will give the world the opportunity to move forward peacefully while continuing to learn how to adapt and live within our

global limits. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Buddy Sandifer and Ernie Chaput will be next.

MR. SANDIFER: Good evening and I bring you greetings from Bamberg, South Carolina. As Mayor Pro Tem of Bamberg, I would like to voice my support and the support of my constituents for the GNEP program and the siting of this facility here in South Carolina. I can tell you without question that an overwhelming majority of the residents of South Carolina, particularly in Bamberg County, are eager to have South Carolina selected for this project. We know that nuclear energy is both safe and cost-efficient, and we realize the economic impact that such an international project would have on our communities. On behalf of our residents, we welcome this project and the facilities. Tonight SRS stands for Selecting the Right Site, SRS. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Ernie, and Carrie Simmons.

MR. CHAPUT: Good evening. My name is Ernie Chaput and I'm the program manager for the Central Savannah River Area Community Team, a team which is formed to perform the detailed siting studies for one of the DOE grants which was mentioned earlier. I'm here to support the DOE's--or the GNEP partnership

initiative, provide just a little bit of background on our team and basically suggest some changes--scoping changes in your GNEP program planning. The CSRA Community Team is led by the Economic Development Partnership of Aiken and Edgefield Counties, partnered with Washington Group International, AREVA and Battelle, three well-qualified industrial organizations with international programs in the development, design, construction, operation and environmental management of nuclear facilities for government and the commercial activities. We strongly support and reiterate what has been said before about the need for the GNEP program. GNEP will address two issues most often cited as barriers to the more aggressive utilization of nuclear; that is, developing more proliferation resistant fuel cycles which can operate in an international regime, and reduction in the amount of nuclear waste, which has the corollary benefit of increasing the amount of energy production from--from your nuclear fuels. We do support and believe that the combination of both the capabilities, broad base support will allow DOE to implement DOE--or the GNEP initiative in the most cost-effective timely manner. Two suggestions, scoping changes for the GNEP Environmental Impact Statement. First, we recommend that the schedule of program activities and facility operations be adjusted to

minimize the unnecessary accumulation of spent nuclear fuel and separated product materials prior to fabrication into reactor fuel. We believe that good public policy in any state will be predicated on the requirement that spent nuclear fuel be expeditiously processed into the forms required for ultimate disposition, whether that ultimate disposition is as waste or--waste in a repository or as a product of reactor fuels. Secondly, we recommend that the GNEP program be revised to include provision for use of separated fuel materials in the current inventory of nuclear reactors. As the program is currently constructed, there will be only one advanced recycling reactor immediately available to use the fuel products produced in the nuclear fuel recycling center. As a result there will be a large monetary investment and accumulation of unused reactor fuels. These reactors fuels should be made available for use in a larger number of reactors, which are expected to be operational when the nuclear fuel recycling center becomes operational. Those are our comments. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

MS. SIMMONS: Good evening. The City of Denmark supports GNEP. As Mayor of Denmark I would like to voice my support and the support of my constituents for

the GNEP program and the siting of the facilities here in South Carolina. I can tell you without question that an overwhelming majority of the residents of South Carolina, particularly in Bamberg County, are eager to have South Carolina selected for the project. We know that nuclear energy is both safe and cost-effective, and we realize the economic impact that such an international project would have on our communities. On behalf of the residents we welcome the GNEP program and the facilities. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Randy Clarke and Edward Lemon will be next.

MR. CLARKE: My name is Randy Clarke and I'm speaking as a private citizen and retiree of the Savannah River Site. I will read in part from a letter to Secretary Bodman from me as follows. Dear Secretary: The Department's goal of closing the nuclear fuel cycle loop in a proliferation-proof manner while reducing radioactive waste is most worthy. May I offer a few observations and recommendations? There are strong reasons for locating all three elements, that is, the nuclear fuel recycling facility, the advanced recycle reactor, and the advanced fuel cycle research facility in one centralized location. There are significant construction efficiencies and savings when all three elements are built within the same

geographic area. Additionally, one centralized infrastructure to support the three facilities can be significantly less expensive and more efficient than three remote independent facilities. The Savannah River Site has the infrastructure, roads, power, utilities, personnel, licensing, support, et cetera, and, most importantly of all, community support for all three facilities. It is important that the advanced fuel cycle research facility at a minimum be constructed near the fuel cycle recycling facility in order to facilitate the continuous operation and communications necessary to have an efficient and effective supported research program. Production-level operational research support is far less effective when conducted over long distances. Direct production contacts are essential to effective research support. Finally, I would like to make a recommendation for the advanced fuel cycle research facility location. The Savannah River National Laboratory should be considered to be the best choice for the proposed facility. In contrast to other national labs, the Savannah River National Lab has been performing production scale--that's large-scale--fuel cycle research and fuel cycle technical support for over 50 years. It is considered by many to be the national leader in this field. Thank you for your consideration.

MR. BROWN: Edward Lemon and then Fred Humes will be next.

MR. LEMON: I'm Edward Lemon. I'm the Mayor of the City of Barnwell. And, Mr. Moderator, I want you to know I was born and raised here and my parents taught me manners and the Golden Rule. So if I run out of time I will quit immediately.

In 2006 the City of Barnwell, South Carolina, provided a letter of support for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership Concept Assessment to be conducted within our region. As you know, our community has a long and firm history of supporting the nuclear industry and the missions involved. In the 1970s our community was host to the only constructed and operational commercial spent nuclear fuel processing plant in the country. Through no fault of theirs, but from Washington policy changes, the facility never went into production and has sat idle for over 25 years. My father was Mayor of Barnwell then, and I'm Mayor now. We fully supported the operation then and we certainly encourage it now. We ask that the Department of Energy do what it should have done 25 years ago and give South Carolina its full consideration for this mission. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Fred Humes, and Vernon Grady will be next.



MR. HUMES: My name is Fred Humes, and I Director of the Economic Development Partnership. And I am here to express my obvious support for the GNEP proposal, and in consideration of other speakers I'm going to submit my letter of support.

MR. BROWN: And I think a new record. Thank you.  
Vernon Grady and--

MR. GRADY: I'll try to be as short.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Mike French is next.

MR. GRADY: My name is Vernon Grady and I'm here on behalf of The Town of Williston. In September 2006 the Town of Williston, South Carolina, wrote a letter in support of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership Concept as a way to reduce our nation's dependence on foreign oil and to provide the energy we will need for the future. As you know, our community and our state have a long and firm history of supporting the nuclear industry, both commercial and government initiatives. In the 1970s our community wholeheartedly supported recycling of spent nuclear fuels, as evidenced by the construction of the Allied General Nuclear Services facility that still stands. We fully support and encourage the establishment of the GNEP program and ask that the Department of Energy give South Carolina its full consideration. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Mike French, and Michael

Hunt will be next.

MR. FRENCH: Good evening. I'm Mike French and I'm the Vice-Chairman of the SRS Retiree Association, SRSRA. What I will read this evening is for DOE Secretary Bodman. And it reads: Dear Secretary, the SRS Retiree Association members have many, many years of experience in both government and commercial nuclear industries. I am pleased to inform you that SRSRA strongly supports the GNEP program and its goal to reduce the amount of spent nuclear fuel, as well as waste volume by reducing long-life radionuclides. The additional goal of producing electricity in a proliferation-protected environment is a beneficial bonus, which should reduce the USA's dependency on foreign oil, as well as significantly reducing the potential for these materials to be used in the construction of nuclear weapons by unfriendly countries. Consequently, we strongly urge DOE to accelerate the EIS process as much as possible starting with the PEIS. In addition, we recommend that you utilize the relevant, exiting information in this process wherever possible to save time and money. South Carolina has a long history with nuclear programs, with over 60 percent of the electricity consumed in the state being produced in nuclear plants. In addition there is a positive 55-year relationship

with the Savannah River Site. The SRS has plenty of available space for the new GNEP facilities--it even has existing facilities that could potentially be utilized--as well as highly qualified and experienced staff, an existing infrastructure, excellent security, the Savannah River National Laboratory to provide GNEP development needs, together with a very important supportive population across the broad CSRA. DOE proposes to design, construct, and operate three major facilities. All of these new facilities could be located at SRS, thereby saving large costs and minimizing movement of nuclear materials offsite. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Michael Hunt and Bobbie Paul will be next.

MR. HUNT: I am Michael Hunt, and I am the Sheriff of Aiken County. And this is a letter of support for GNEP. A top priority for the United States of America is energy independence. I, Sheriff of Aiken County, believe that in order for us to become less dependent on foreign energy sources we must escalate our commercial nuclear energy programs. But only by addressing the issue of waste from our current reactors and future reactors can our citizens feel comfortable that the waste will be dealt with in a safe and efficient manner with minimal risk of proliferation. I

have reviewed the goals of GNEP and feel confident that this advanced nuclear fuel cycle development initiative is the proper way to handle this sensitive material. Additionally, the initiative is a responsible way to address nonproliferation concerns. In closing, we have had many occasions to work with security forces at the site and have a very positive relationship with these forces, especially when it came to mutual aide that we had to call upon during our train derailment in Graniteville. These security forces were very instrumental in helping us evacuate our citizens and having a very rapid response coming to our aid. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Bobbie Paul. She will be followed by Emma Ogley-Oliver.

MS. PAUL: Thank you. My name is Bobbie Paul. I'm the Executive Director of Women's Action for New Directions, the Georgia chapter in Atlanta. We have members around the country and several in this area around Savannah River Site. I would like to speak against GNEP or, as I like to call it, the gargantuan nuclear expansion program. I do have an article that I'll be submitting that was published in the Atlanta Journal & Constitution. The main focus of that is that this is being sold as recycling and I think that's very

disingenuous because it's really reprocessing. I'm very thankful that we've been talking tonight mostly about reprocessing and that dirty dangerous, process. What I would suggest for the scoping, just a few comments, is that we have a lot more public awareness of this issue. I don't know how many people in these rural areas around here or even in Atlanta know anything about this. I first heard about GNEP last February when I was up in Washington, and I knew a lot more than my Congresspeople. Do we need to flier, go on the computer or how do we get to people who are all downwind and downstream? Secondly, I think we need to reexamine the premise that nuclear power is safe, healthy, and a viable alternative and a lesser threat than wind, solar or biomass. I would suggest doing this through self-education. And this might not be in your jurisdiction, but I think to be fair to the people that are involved with such a toxic deadly substances we need a lot more public education on this issue. I hope that we'll revisit the need for nuclear. I think that we need open forums--educational. I hope that there's money for these available. I think we need to be more honest with people about the toxicity of the elements involved, the radionuclides involved, no matter how new the designs are. And I think we ought to talk about why reprocessing was canceled by

Presidents Ford and Carter due to proliferation of plutonium. And in closing, I just wanted to reiterate that GNEP would produce upwards of 360 to 600 tons of plutonium. And one needs less than 20 pounds of plutonium to make a nuclear bomb. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Emma, and Judith Stocker will follow.

MS. OGLEY-OLIVER: Thank you for the time today. I appreciate everyone's interest in this issue. It's really something we should all think about. It is important that we learn from previous attempts at recycling or reprocessing nuclear waste or spent fuel.

Russia, the UK, France have all spent a lot of money on this idea and are either in the process of stopping or have long since lost these operations to reprocess nuclear waste. Such operations have been plagued with serious problems. Their operations have gained a lot of negative attention. Why are we not looking into why these operations have gained so much negative attention? This isn't a good thing. With regard to GNEP we have bombarded with terms such as partnership of recycling. This sounds great; right? We all like partnerships. We all like recycling. But upon further investigation this partnership will not be an equal partnership. We will get the raw deal. We want a

partnership that benefits us all, not hurts us. If we accept this partnership it will benefit the nuclear industry. Will it benefit us as citizens? No. We hear of promises for jobs. What kind of jobs? How about jobs that are safe? That would be a novel idea.

Regarding another term that we hear associated with GNEP, recycling, again, this sounds great. But don't we--don't get it twisted. This is not the recycling that we all do at home. This is not the same as recycling our paper or household waste. When we commit to recycle our household waste we do not put our neighbors and our country at increased risk of terrorist attacks and environmental poison. This partnership is not good for us. This type of recycling is not good for us. Do we want partnerships that will strengthen our communities? Yes. This partnership is not the one we want. Together let's say thank you, but no thank you to this partnership and seek better offers. Together we can build strength in our communities by accepting partnerships that will work for us. In the meantime let's stick to recycling nontoxic household waste and not nuclear toxic waste. Thank you very much for your time.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Judith Stocker, and Thomas Williams will be next.

MS. STOCKER: Good evening. My name is Judy

Stocker. I live in the City of Keysville, Georgia. And the main reason that my community has a municipal water and sewer system is that the federal government had to step in and provide one when contamination from a spill at Savannah River Site contaminated the drinking water in our wells. So you'll forgive me for being a little sensitive on this issue. The bottom line is in spite all the hocus-pocus about not polluting the air and not providing greenhouse gases, nuclear energy is not clean energy. It provides nuclear waste and toxins that will not be dissipated in our lifetimes or the lifetimes of our children or our grandchildren or their grandchildren or their great-grandchildren. You keep talking about reasonable risk, reasonable impact, reasonable alternatives. What do you consider reasonable? How many lives have to be lost or ruined before it's reasonable not to go for whatever is going to provide economic increase? I say that we just need to look at the fact that to the person who loses one friend, one neighbor, one family member there's no such thing as insubstantial or reasonable loss. I propose that as an alternative number three--as alternative number three to GNEP, that we just abandon this whole idea and look for truly clean and safe energy sources. Biofuel and solar energy come to mind. My community has already been a



victim of one nuclear waste accident. I'm not willing to risk the--I'm not willing to run the risk, no matter how insignificant or reasonable you think it is, of my community being victimized by another such accident.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Thomas Williams and Dianne Valentin will follow.

MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Thomas Williams and I'm a member of the Barnwell County Council. I am honored to speak tonight on behalf of the constituents of Barnwell County, who I represent as a member of the Barnwell County Council. Without hesitation, our citizens fully support the location of the nuclear reprocessing facility for the GNEP program in our part of South Carolina. South Carolinians are experienced and proficient in the nuclear industry, and we have provided an adept workforce and safe site for the Department of Energy's programs for half a century. There should be no doubt that South Carolina is the best location for the GNEP program's facilities and our citizens are the most qualified to foster this program and its missions. We respectfully request that you locate the GNEP facility in South Carolina. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Dianne Valentin and Betsy Rivard is next.

MS. VALENTIN: Greetings everyone. My name is Dianne Valentin, and I am up from Atlanta. I'm a

citizen of this country. And please be assured that the effects of bringing GNEP will not just affect your communities. It will affect our nation. It will not make us safer. It will make us more vulnerable. What I want you to consider is that a GNEP is going to be funded by taxpayer dollars. The EIS analysis should state how and why. The EIS analysis should say clearly how much nuclear waste will be generated and how much it will cost to store it for its lifetime, and I mean its full lifetime. The EIS analysis should clearly state why GNEP is being promoted as clean energy when the waste generated is so toxic and long-lived. I also need for you to be more clear in the documents you produce for community consumption in using terms such as disposal when, in fact, it's only stored waste. It is never disposed of. Also one of my colleagues mentioned that--we were talking and she said when you have a water-resistant jacket it's still--it's not waterproof. It's just water resistant. Having proliferation-resistant reactors does not mean they are proliferation proof. We need to give that consideration. Also I think you need to be clear about how many members of the public have to be opposed to this before it doesn't happen. There have been several members of the public representatives who have come up and stated what they--the support that they give. I'm

a constituent of Saxby Chambliss, and I am one person that I--and I know well over 5,000 people in--who are represented by Saxby Chambliss and Johnny Isakson who do not support this. So please consider that when you're reading and accepting the statements from these public representatives.

MR. BROWN: Okay. I'm sorry. You're at the 2-minute mark.

MS. VALENTIN: Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. We have Betsy Rivard, and Jim Kearse will follow.

MS. RIVARD: Hello. I'm Betsy Rivard from Atlanta, Women's Action for New Directions. I thank you for the time, albeit short. I do agree we need safe, clean, and secure--a safe, clean, secure source of energy, and that is why I'm opposed to GNEP and nuclear power. Nuclear power requires subsidizing, which you, the taxpayer, are going to have to do. Nobody on Wall Street would invest in this very expensive source of power. My mother taught me and I've taught my children to clean up your mess before making a new one. I think that we are not doing that.

We have 300--35 million gallons of waste here at Savannah River Site already. The only commercial reprocessing plant was in West Valley, New York, and it

took them 6 years to process 1 year's worth of fuel, which produced 600,000 gallons of liquid highly radioactive waste. I heard an analogy--I think it's really apt--using this recycling, which is really not recycling--reprocessing--to get rid of nuclear material is like trying to get rid of milk by giving it to a cow because it's just going to come right back out and there'll be a lot more again. So I don't think any--you know, to claim that this is really solving our problem is ridiculous. And I think it's hypocritical of us to say that we can combine a weapons plant with this stuff from nuclear power plants, and at the same time we tell Iran that, you know, we don't believe that you were just doing nuclear power 'cause people don't do that. We know it 'cause we're trying to do it ourselves. The barrier is gone that used to be there. We are leaving our children a terrible legacy of waste, cost--it's just ridiculously expensive--and we're going to be the--our grandchildren are going to be the ones that have to pay for it, our great-grandchildren.

MR. BROWN: Okay. If you have just one summary statement.

MS. RIVARD: Okay. And the summary statement is I loved your slides. They were very professional and well produced, but there's one very important one that

was missing. I want to see a slide of what goes in and what comes out. It's a simple request. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Jim Kearse and Clair Guess will be next.

MR. KEARSE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Jim Kearse. I represent Barnwell County Council. I'm also a member of the Southern Carolina Alliance. I'm also a member of the Lower Savannah River Council of Governments. We have seven nuclear power plants in South Carolina. They have all of their spent fuel rods at each site. Yucca Mountain is no closer today than it was 10 years ago of doing anything. Recycling these spent fuel rods will to away with seven nuclear storage sites in South Carolina alone. Don't throw away the gold. We all recycle aluminum cans. Recycling spent fuel is more important. When we have the lights to go out one hot summer day and that air conditioner turns off or gas prices go to \$5 a gallon we will realize too late how serious it is. A spent fuel recycling facility and a next generation nuclear power reactor is needed now. Oil, gas, coal-fired powerhouses are filling the air and streams with pollutants. Mercury and greenhouse gases are coming from these power plants. Nuclear power plants are more environmental friendly than oil, gas or coal-fired power plants. We

need to develop environmental friendly fuels for our transportation needs. We need to develop hydrogen fuel technology without using natural gas in the process to develop it. Look at the accidents that the gas and coal industry has that has resulted in injuries and deaths. Nuclear is safer and cleaner than oil, gas, and coal and has a lower operating cost. Worldwide growth of electricity production will need nuclear to control the environmental damage. South Carolina depends 60 percent--ma'am, I was quiet when you were speaking. Please be quiet when I'm speaking. South Carolina depends 60 percent on nuclear power. Advanced designs will be much safer and cheaper. Fuel meltdowns will be impossible. The bottom line, I want the best quality of life for myself, my children and grandchildren. Worldwide energy production is expected to grown nearly 60 percent in the next couple of decades. If we don't want to seriously damage earth's environment we will need to increase the use of cleaner energy. For that we need nuclear power production. We in Barnwell County want to continue to be a leader in the nuclear field. South Carolina is the right place to demonstrate the next generation spent fuel recycling facility and power reactor. We want the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership demonstration here in South Carolina. I thank you for your time.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Clair Guess, and Mal McKibben will be next.

MR. GUESS: Good evening. My name is Clair Guess. I serve on the County Council in Bamberg County. It is my honor to speak tonight in favor of GNEP project and to ask the Department of Energy to give South Carolina, especially Barnwell, your highest consideration in selecting the site for Global Nuclear Energy Partnership program and facilities. As a member of the Bamberg County Council, I can attest to the fact that the project would have a positive impact on our economy and our people would welcome the job creation from the nuclear fuel processing plant. Our citizens welcome the GNEP project, and we hope that South Carolina is selected as your site. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Mal McKibben and Leslie Miner will follow.

MR. MCKIBBEN: I am Mal McKibben, Executive Director of Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness or CNTA. I'm real proud of the fact that CNTA is the world's largest citizen-based pronuclear education and advocacy group. We've got a little over 2,000 members and we've got about forty corporate sponsors and business members. When we talk about the criteria that one might choose for a facility like the GNEP

facilities I want to mention a few of those and comment on them. One is experience. There are, including SRS and the Barnwell facilities, over 50 years of very safe, very efficient nuclear research, reactor design and operation, recycling of nuclear fuel, and the management of those wastes. None of the other facilities being considered can make that statement. Safety. For all our 50-plus years the Savannah River Site nuclear facilities have had one of the best record of safety--that's a fact; not an opinion--of any nuclear facilities in the country. And if you didn't know it, the nuclear facilities in this country have a far better record of safety than industry as a whole. Safe design and operation of nuclear facilities is at the very heart of all the activities we do, and it always has been. Community support. I think you've seen the example of that here today very plainly. No other area being considered has the very strong community support offered in this area, and we're very proud of that. This area includes at least seven counties located in Georgia and South Carolina. And all of our elected officials in this area, from city halls to the congress, support the GNEP program.

MR. BROWN: You're right at 2 minutes now.

MR. MCKIBBEN: Pardon?

MR. BROWN: You're at 2 minutes.



MR. MCKIBBEN: Okay. I'll wrap it up quickly then. Security. We have by far the best security system at Savannah River Site than exists in the country, and that's by independent evaluation of security. We have the best emergency coordination center in the country. It's already here, and GNEP can benefit from it. In conclusion, the GNEP program in our opinion is essential for the worldwide expansion of the safe, clean, efficient nuclear energy. And we are quite certain that this area is by far the best area for it. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thanks. Let me mention if folks are going to be talking out in the lobby if you'd close the doors. I think there's been some interference with people hearing in the back row. Okay. Leslie Miner, and Melanie Knight will follow.

MS. MINERD: Hello. Thank you for having me here. In order to appease the nuclear industry the federal government in 1982 promised them that a deep geological repository for all their spent fuel rods would be built. But the people of Nevada don't want Yucca Mountain, the chosen repository site. So our government and their corporate partners have come up with the idea of GNEP, which involves reprocessing our nation's and eventually much of the world's stockpile

of commercial nuclear waste. Worldwide over half of the plutonium being reprocessed is being stored on site along with a large stream of liquid radioactive waste which is a reprocessing byproduct. The U.S. House of Representatives stated in regards to GNEP that the first step of any site's willingness to host such a reprocessing facility is its willingness to receive into interim storage spent fuel in dry caskets beginning this decade. In other words, the government might not build the planned reprocessing plant or fast-burning reactor this decade, next decade, ever. But since you, South Carolina, are willing to go ahead or willing--remember, willing--we're going to go ahead and ship you all the spent reactor fuel from all the U.S. commercial reactors and some foreign reactors sometime in this decade. In the U.S. any reprocessing plant or potential reprocessing site will likely become a de facto Yucca Mountain. South Carolina is already carrying a heavy disproportionate burden in terms of nuclear waste. SRS is already storing 26 metric tons of foreign reactor fuel in the H Canyon. For decades SRS has stored 36 million gallons of liquid radioactive waste in their tank farm. It was graded for reprocessing. Though millions of dollars have been spent in search of a cure there is no solution in sight for properly disposing of this liquid radioactive

waste. The most troubling part about GNEP is the G part, the global part. Exporting nuclear technology to our allies is problematic because a country we consider an ally one week can become an enemy by next week. In 1981 our government suddenly deemed Iraq an ally and began aiding them in their war against Iran, who happened to be our ally 2 years previous. Well, we all know what happened to Iraq, or is still happening. And now Iran claims they want to use the peaceful atom for energy production. How do you think Pakistan is going to feel about the U.S.-sponsored nukes we've already promised India. Do as I say and not as I do doesn't work for children and it doesn't work for inspiring nuclear safety either.

MR. BROWN: You're at just about 2 minutes, if you can wrap up, please.

MS. MINERD: I'm wrapping it up.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MS. MINERD: Okay. The federal government should be listening to the people who are going to pay for this, the taxpayers, not the corporations who are going to benefit from this. If nuclear power is so safe and clean our government should quit subsidizing it now. If GNEP is such a great idea let the corporations and their investors pony up and quit feeding from the federal troughs. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Melanie Knight, and Susan Corbett will be next.

MS. KNIGHT: There is a classic children's game called Gnip Gnop, in which players bang on paddle switches trying to be the first to propel all the balls through a row of hoops and onto their opponent's side of the game. In South Carolina we are in danger of playing a deadly version of this game, in which the rest of the country and world sends their highly radioactive nuclear waste. Call it GNEP GNEP. We have the carrots of jobs and money dangled in our faces, but there are jobs and money to be made in cleanup. And money cannot keep us safe. Tons of plutonium produced by GNEP in our state. The balls of hazardous waste are all coming to our side of the game and our own paddle switches are broken. We cannot send the balls back into our opponent's court. We lose. The people of South Carolina lose. A rich corpse is still a corpse. The GNEP presents not only an environmental danger but a magnet for terrorists. And yet our governmental representatives invite this possibility with their support of GNEP. I do not want our beautiful state to lose this game and become a nuclear wasteland. Accidents can happen no matter how experienced the workers. Just because it has not happened yet does not mean it cannot happen. To brag about a lack of

accidents seems to tempt fate and show a lack of gratitude for the grace of God. Imagine a nuclear Graniteville disaster. I say no to GNEP.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Susan Corbett, and Robert Guild is next.

MS. CORBETT: Good evening. My name is Susan Corbett. I'm the Conservation Chair of the South Carolina Chapter of the Sierra Club. I come here this evening representing about 6,000 members statewide and 700,000 members nationwide. The Sierra Club has been addressing the problems associated with nuclear power since the early '70s. In '74 the Board said, we oppose the licensing, construction and operation of new nuclear reactors pending development of adequate national and global policies to curb energy overuse and unnecessary growth and pending resolution of the significant problems inherent in disposal of spent fuel. Looking back on 1974, we know there has never been a national attempt to curb energy overuse. In fact, there has been a consistent push to encourage consumers to use more and more. This is what generates profits for energy companies. Here in South Carolina we use more energy per capita than almost any other state, our usage far exceeding the national average. Our citizens have been given very little education or

motivation to conserve energy. Looking back at that 1974 statement, we also see there has been no resolution to the significant problem inherent in the disposal of spent fuel. In fact, just as citizen activists predicted 40 years ago, there is no safe, cheap or environmentally sound method for isolating poisonous wastes that will be deadly for thousands of years, despite all the industry promises to the contrary. The Bush Administration is now resorting to this extreme Global Nuclear Energy Partnership plan to try and sweep the waste issue under the rug by telling us recycling is the answer. If only it were; if only it were recycling, that is. There is very little resembling true recycling in the reprocessing of highly radioactive nuclear fuel, except maybe the recycling of government welfare for the unprofitable nuclear industry and the spending of taxpayer money over and over again. The Global Nuclear Energy Partnership would not recycle radioactive waste. It would reprocess it. Reprocessing is the separation of plutonium from radioactive waste and results in massive quantities of new caustic, liquid, highly radioactive waste. As early as 1977 the Sierra Club recognized the grave dangers associated with reprocessing. In May of that year the Board wrote, it is essential that nuclear fuel reprocessing, which separates plutonium and makes

it accessible, be banned throughout the world. In hindsight it is easy to see why the Board viewed plutonium separation as a worldwide problem because in 1974 India developed a nuclear bomb using plutonium from reprocessed fuel.

MR. BROWN: And just a few more key points.

MS. CORBETT: Okay. In terms of environmental health--environmental hazards we only have to look at the failures at West Valley and we speak of Sellafield, England and La Hague, France. They've contributed enormous amounts of radioactive emissions in their countries. Children 100 miles away have found plutonium in their teeth. Finally in 1986, the Board wrote, we want to reaffirm its opposition to breeder reactor programs and ancillary projects. And the new generation of reactors proposed in the GNEP are conceptually similar to fast breeder reactors, which have been shown worldwide to be dangerous and expensive. France and Japan have lost billions of dollars and have narrowly escaped disasters in their experiments with fast reactors. The idea of basing our energy future on a hypothetical experimental reactor with prototypes that are riddled with dangerous flaws is something only an administration with an environmental record like the Bush Administration could come up with. In conclusion--

MR. BROWN: Okay. Conclude--

MS. CORBETT: In conclusion, Sierra Club, in accordance with its longstanding policies, opposes all aspects of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership and rejects it because it is a fundamentally dirty, dangerous and extremely expensive experiment by an industry that should have gone by the wayside years ago. The future energy needs of the world can be met by a myriad of other cleaner, safer, and in the long run more economical technologies than nuclear power. President Bush recently said America is addicted to oil. The South Carolina Chapter of the Sierra Club says South Carolina is addicted to nuclear waste and the financial high it brings. But like all addictions, the long-term consequences of the relentless injections of radiation into our air, soil and water will leave us sick and contaminated and will ultimately destroy our quality of life.

MR. BROWN: In conclusion are becoming my favorite words. Our next speaker is Robert Guild, and Allison Peller is next.

MR. GUILD: Good evening. I'm Robert Guild. I'm the Chair of the South Carolina Chapter of the Sierra Club. Susan well summarized the Sierra Club's national position in opposition to the expansion of nuclear



power and to reprocessing or now we hear tonight recycling of the nuclear waste and nuclear fuel. In particular we oppose the Department of Energy's failure to responsibly manage the nuclear waste that we have entrusted it with over the last 50 years. It is the height of hypocrisy for the Department of Energy to come before the people of South Carolina and tell us they have an energy solution when they have not solved the energy problem that is in our backyard for the last 50 years. And we have had enough. We have had enough of the bait-and-switch telling us that if we just accept the dollars that are involved in these attractive government contracts they promise that there will be an exit strategy for the nation's nuclear waste that come into South Carolina. We do not trust you, Department of Energy. We do not believe your false promises any longer. South Carolina, for the last 25 years, has been the nation's nuclear waste dumping ground. The nuclear renaissance that is promised to us tonight will make South Carolina the world's nuclear waste dumping ground. No thank you. There is absolutely no assurance in this nuclear nightmare that the nuclear waste backing up at commercial nuclear plants around the world will ever leave South Carolina.

If you believe the promise that they would safely manage the nuclear bomb waste that sits in 36 million

gallons of corroding steel tanks mere miles away from the Savannah River, the drinking water supply of our members at Hilton Head, then believe the promises they are making to us tonight. I don't think so. We have seen that the commercial management of nuclear waste on the Chem Nuclear side of the fence line has resulted in a half-mile tritium plume that already contaminates Merry's Branch Creek which flows to the Savannah River.

And, again, we have seen unmet promises to clean up the 36 million gallons in the high-level corroded steel tanks. We have seen the failed design of the Allied General Nuclear Services facility that thankfully sits mothballed outside the SRS fence. And can you believe that 30 years later we would actually think of reviving this corpse, plugging it in and trying to operate it again? This is insanity.

MR. BROWN: Just one final point, please.

MR. GUILD: We strongly urge DOE, first and foremost, to honor its promises to the people of South Carolina and clean up the high-level waste that you have accumulated from your mismanagement over the last 50 years before you ask us to accept one more drop of nuclear waste from out of South Carolina. No more nuclear waste dumping ground in our beautiful state. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Allison Peller, and Ed

Burgess will follow.

MS. PELLER: My name is Allison Peeler and thank you for letting me speak. I've lived in South Carolina all my life and I am not supporting GNEP. A couple of things to consider in your statements. Economically are we as U.S. citizens going to be paying for the world to have energy? Are we going to build the reactors in the countries? And are we going to take the responsibility of the accidents, cleaning up leaks and other things that happen around the globe? Also I'd like for you to look at the billions that's already wasted on the reprocessing programs that have been implemented earlier like the Atkins plant, which was built but never come online, and the West Valley plant.

Environmental health concerns, I think you should consider the accidents that are going to occur on train tracks and transfer trucks on interstates and going through small towns, on mountain lanes or in--and in shipments coming across the ocean because there could be accidents that contaminate the whole ocean. And also terrorists could stop them and take the waste and create stuff. That's not what we want them to do. France may not have accidents but they dump waste in the ocean. Will other partner nations dispose of their waste in the same way? And they dispose of it by a

loophole saying it's discharge and not dumping. I think we need to reassess the definition of recycling because recycling aluminum cans, it goes in and it comes out with an aluminum can. Reprocessing you go in with a spent fuel rod and you don't get a spent fuel rod. You end up with uranium, plutonium and a mess of polluted high-level waste which will be considered low-level waste to be disposed of in a much gentler fashion. I think there needs to be a better job of informing the people and the public that GNEP will have no effect on foreign oil dependency. That's not our energy or electricity; that's our SUV obsession and our low miles per gallon standards. I think the drinking water standards--

MR. BROWN: You're just about at 2 minutes.

MS. PELLER: Okay. Our drinking water standards should include children and women and elderly and pregnant women. I don't think we should be considering taking on the world's waste when we can't dispose of our country's or our state's. And I don't think we should be considering a program that's failed for 30 years. And I suggest the alternative to expand the nuclear program would be cleanup. I also suggest reassessing your definition of an alternate that has to expand the nuclear program into expanding clean energy in a safe and effective way. And I'd also like to tell

people that--tell people that are out there being rude making snide comments about people taking longer times that it's more courteous and kind to get up here and put the facts in intelligent arguments than kissing DOE's ass.

MR. BROWN: Ed Burgess. Is Ed Burgess here?  
Eddie Bussey, and David Turner is next.

MR. BUSSEY: I'm Eddie Bussey, Executive Board Member for the SRS Community Reuse Organization. The SRS Community Reuse Organization fully supports the proposed Global Nuclear Energy Partnership initiative.

We believe GNEP is a vital component of our country's pressing need to establish energy independence by increasing our reliance on nuclear power, lessening our unhealthy dependence on fossil fuels and ensuring a plentiful supply of electricity to help fuel future economic growth. We are enthusiastic about GNEP, in part, because of its potential to reduce the overall volume of nuclear waste. As an organization, we are on record expressing our concern about the slow pace of permanent geologic disposal at Yucca Mountain. We are disappointed that Yucca Mountain remains mired in controversy and that its completion schedule continues to slip. We do not want SRS to become a de facto permanent storage facility if Yucca Mountain never opens. Finally, we want to reiterate that an important

part of our mission as the designated SRS Community Reuse Organization is to speak with a single, unified voice on behalf of our five-county, two-state region. We wish to express our unequivocal support for GNEP and for siting its facilities within the five-county CSRA. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. David Turner, and Don Alexander will follow.

MR. TURNER: I'm David Turner, Pastor at Barnwell Presbyterian Church. First let me state that I agree with our Mayor concerning courtesy and manners. My mama also taught me how to use appropriate language. I also own land and I'm a proud citizen of Barnwell County, but I also own land and have parents living in Savannah, Georgia. I firmly support the GNEP initiative and believe it would be of tremendous benefit to our communities and to our nation. Having lived in Barnwell and having been associated with good people who have worked at Energy Solutions and Savannah River Site I trust their dedication to careful work in these areas. To let the material sit unprocessed is dangerous and is basically stupid. Are there problems to be overcome? Yes. But in a world faced with terrorism and diminishing fossil fuels we must look elsewhere for our energy sources. 25 years to 30 years ago we turned our backs on recycling nuclear materials.

That was a mistake. Our community still supports this endeavor. It was right then; it is right tonight. And not only is it right for the future in Barnwell and our nation, it is good stewardship for the planet God has entrusted to our care. I am fully convinced this is the right way to being our journey forward. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Don Alexander, and John Sanders will be next.

MR. ALEXANDER: Good evening. I am a citizen of Barnwell County, South Carolina, as well. I am here tonight to express my support for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership concept coming to our region. I've also worked a lot in environmental issues. We really need a nuclear power industry. Everything has its dangers. There's enough water here to kill several people in this room if it's used in the wrong way. We need something like GNEP so that we can take a very positive form of energy and learn how to use it in the right way and have the infrastructure to do it. We ask that the Department of Energy give South Carolina and our region its full consideration for this mission. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: John Sanders. Susan Winsor--Susan is coming up. Rhonda McElveen will follow Susan.

MS. WINSOR: Good evening. I am Susan Winsor, President of Aiken Technical College, and I'm here to

support the siting of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership in the CSRA. Aiken Technical College has been privileged to partner with business, industry, education and economic development leaders over the course of its existence. We are pleased to do so again as we look forward to our region's leadership role in the GNEP initiative. We value our proud tradition of meeting the workforce needs of our partners by assuring a high-skilled, highly trained workforce whose skills may be updated on demand. In addition, we provide a full range of facilitation services that include workforce recruiting and testing, curriculum and materials development, customized training and project management. GNEP provides for the safe expansion of clean, affordable nuclear power, the only proven technology that can provide abundant supplies of base-load electricity reliably and without air pollution or emissions of greenhouse gases. Reducing our reliance on fossil fuels while protecting and improving the environment are twin goals that demand our best efforts. GNEP is a significant step in the right direction. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Rhonda McElveen.

MS. MCELVEEN: Hi. I am just an average citizen of the County of Barnwell, South Carolina. And I am here tonight to express my support for the Global



Nuclear Energy Partnership concept assessment and program coming to our region. I ask that the Department of Energy give South Carolina and our region its full consideration for this mission. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. I've got two names that the note says unclear on the last name. So let me try these. Marty Manfior.

MR. MARTIN: I can do that for you.

MR. BROWN: Good. Okay. The court reporter will probably appreciate that. Also if--if folks want to have conversations if they'll step out to the lobby to allow the speakers full attention. Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: My name is--

MR. BROWN: If you'll spell your name.

MR. MARTIN: --Marty Martin. Thank you. I'll try to write more legibly next time. I'm Marty Martin, Director of the Barnwell County Economic Development Commission. As Director of the Barnwell County Economic Development Commission I am here tonight to express our county's support of the GNEP project and to urge the Department of Energy to locate the facility in South Carolina. We appreciate and understand the scope of this project and its economic impact on our communities. We ask that the Department of Energy give South Carolina and our region its full consideration for the GNEP project. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: The next name we had a little problem with--it looks like J.D. Atkins perhaps. Does that sound familiar? No? Okay. We'll try Gretchen Birch or Gretchen Birt. And Tim Schatzer will follow Gretchen.

MS. BIRT: Hello. I am Gretchen Birt. I'm the Executive Director of the Barnwell County Chamber of Commerce. On behalf of the Barnwell County Chamber of Commerce I am here tonight to voice our full support of locating GNEP's nuclear reprocessing facilities in South Carolina. Our organization realizes the economic benefits that a project of this scale would bring to the surrounding business communities and we are prepared and eager to embrace these opportunities. Since the 1950s our local businesses have served the nuclear community and shared in their success. We have also felt the losses to our economy from downsizing at the Savannah River Site. In short, we welcome the economic stimulation from this GNEP project, we are prepared for it, and we are capable of supporting this project of international import to our country. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Tim Schatzer, and Charles Utley will be next.

MR. SCHATZER: My name is Tim Schatzer. I'm a resident--a long-time resident of Barnwell County. I'm

also the father of two bright and healthy young children who have lived their entire lives in Barnwell County. I'm a small business owner. I'm a physicist and I've spent most of my career working in the environmental field. And I'm here to say that I fully support the GNEP in our area of the state. While the rest of the country is enjoying an economic upswing, we continue to languish in our area of South Carolina. The unemployment rate in the country hovers around 4 percent. Our unemployment rate is in the double digits. We need the economic infusion into our area. As energy consumption grows exponentially in the coming decades, the demand for clean, safe nuclear energy and its supporting facilities will be needed and they will happen. It, therefore, only makes sense to locate these facilities in areas where the local community welcomes them and in areas where workers already possess the skill sets to build and operate them. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Charles Utley, and Brenda Barnett will be next.

MR. UTLEY: Charles Utley with the Hyde Park Improvement Committee, Augusta, Georgia. I want to address the EIS with about three things that I am concerned with. And one of them is the partnership or

the collaborative that the--that the GNEP will actually engage in. I would like to--for the EIS to really go into that and take a look at it as well as partnerships and who are these partnerships and how reliable are they for the future. The next thing is that I'm interested in the terrorism. Whether it's at the air, land or sea, I would like to know how it's going to be protected and why are we doing it when we can't protect those right now. The second thing--or the third thing I'm interested in is the health and--in those who are located in and around the site, those who have not reached the maturity level. I'm talking about the infants, the babies, the unborns. I would like to know how the impact of this partnership is going to affect them. Let me just give you a little reason why I'm backing up a little bit. I'm very interested in the cost. And I say cost because when I look at it and I heard the other day that this United States is basing its 2010 budget on cutting the military, downsizing or whatever it's going to take to balance the budget. So I'm interested in it because if you're balancing the budget on the backs of those who are fighting in Iran and Iraq now and you don't know whether Iran bought the bomb over that hill or something right here in our state. I'm interested in it because if we can balance the budget on the backs of those who are fighting now

why can't we spend 280 million billion dollars?  
Something is wrong with that figure. Something is wrong with it because if we have that much money to spend in a partnership why can't we do something here to protect those who are fighting today in foreign lands? I say that because it is very interesting. If we have that kind of money to throw away why can't we look now at what we are wasting now in a war with no end, with nuclear waste that's flowing? You can't protect them from day to day on transport from going from one end of the city to another. Then how can you protect them when nuclear waste is going to be flowing everywhere? Look at your partners. Is it worth getting in bed to have a partnership where you don't know where it is going? I just want the EIS to address it. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Brenda Barnett, and Nancy Foster will be next.

MS. BARNETT: Good evening. My name is Brenda Barnett. I'm from the City of Denmark located in Bamberg County, speaking on behalf of President Lee Monroe, Voorhees University. Good evening. It is an honor and pleasure to speak tonight in regard to the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership program locating its facilities in South Carolina. At this time I would

like to share a statement of support from the President of Voorhees College, Dr. Lee E. Monroe. On behalf of Voorhees College, we would like to extend our appreciation to the Department of Energy for the consideration of our state for the GNEP program and its facilities. Our students, faculty, and alumni welcome this important project which will marry energy security, recycling, and job creation with an effort to decrease our dependence on foreign oil. Such a marriage is a win-win for our community, where the nuclear industry has enjoyed the support of DOE missions by our citizens since the 1950s. This ongoing relationship has developed a workforce that crosses generations and understands the needs of the nuclear industry. Voorhees College can provide graduates who possess the technology, business and management skills to support this project. We also offer our support in partnership and cooperation with other institutions of higher learning, our technical schools, our business community, South Carolina Alliance, and our industrial community to make your construction and operation of the GNEP project one that would--one that the world will point to as a model of innovation. Voorhees College stands ready to meet the challenges of the GNEP program and we implore the Department of Energy to select South Carolina for this project of international

importance. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Nancy Foster, and Clint Carter will be next.

MS. FOSTER: Bamberg County Chamber of Commerce supports GNEP. As a board member of the Bamberg County Chamber of Commerce I would like to voice my support and the support of my membership for the GNEP program and the siting of the facilities here in South Carolina. We've done our homework and we're eager to have South Carolina selected for the project. We know that nuclear energy is safe and cost-effective and we realize the economic impact that such a project will have on our communities. On behalf of our membership we welcome the GNEP program.

MR. BROWN: Clint Carter. And John Ganus, Mayor of Govan, would be next.

MR. CARTER: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Good evening. It's my honor to speak tonight in favor of GNEP project and to ask the Department of Energy to give South Carolina your highest consideration in selecting the site for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership program and its facilities.

As a member of Bamberg County Council, I can attest to the fact that the project would have a positive impact on our economy and our people would welcome the job creation from the nuclear fuel processing plant. Our

citizens welcome the GNEP project and we hope that South Carolina is selected to your sites--is selected as your site. And for more further information, those of you who are concerned about your assurance of your security and your well-being I would pray that you would seek Jesus Christ and He can answer all your problems.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. I would now like to--is it Mayor Ganus? Right. I was corrected on the way. And Jasper Vara will follow the mayor.

MR. GANUS: I would like to start this statement by saying that the City of Govan supports GNEP. The City of Govan is rural, very rural. We're considered to be in the backyard of Savannah River Plant. I also would like to say that I know each of our citizens in Govan. When I see them I know their name, their faces. And to end this statement I would like to say on behalf of the residents of the City of Govan, we welcome GNEP, its program and the facilities. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Jasper Vara [sic], and Walter O'Rear will be next.

MR. VARN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good evening. I'm Jasper Varn. I'm a life citizen of Bamberg County, South Carolina. And I'm here tonight to express my sincere support for the Global Nuclear



Energy Participation concept assignment and program coming to our area. I think it would certainly enhance our entire area, our region. And having been association with the military for 40 years I think that it would certainly enhance our military and for us to be prepared for what we're up against now. Thank you very much. And we certainly support and urge you to select our area for your program.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Walter O'Rear, and Robert Chatman will follow the mayor.

MR. O'REAR: I am Walter O'Rear, the Mayor of Olar, South Carolina, located in Bamberg County. And I want to say my council and my citizens of our little town support GNEP, and I think it would be an asset to our area. And we--definitely I think that we need it and I think the financial benefits would be great and also I think that our people do support this in South Carolina. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay. Robert Chatman. Frances Johnson will follow Robert.

MR. CHATMAN: Good evening. My name is Robert Chatman. As Chairman of the Bamberg County Economic Development Commission, I am here tonight to express our support of the GNEP project and facilities and to urge the Department of Energy to locate this facility here in South Carolina. The people of Bamberg County

have worked on DOE missions for generations now, and we have cultivated a workforce that is both appreciative of and skilled in the nuclear industry and its support services. For many years our local economy flourished under the impact of having a DOE facility in our region, and we have also suffered with the downsizing of the Savannah River Plant as DOE missions were diminished. What has not diminished though--diminished, I'm sorry--is our support of the Department of Energy and the nuclear industry. Our citizens both need and want this GNEP project here in South Carolina and we stand ready to carry out this mission. We ask that the Department of Energy give South Carolina and our regional its full consideration for this GNEP project. We thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Frances Johnson, and Bruce Watson will follow.

MS. JOHNSON: I bring you greetings from the City of Bamberg, who supports GNEP. As a member of Bamberg City Council, I would like to voice my support and the support of all my constituents for the GNEP program and the siting of the facilities here in South Carolina and our region. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Frances. Bruce Watson, and Isaiah Odom is next.

MR. WATSON: Good evening. My name is Bruce

Watson. I'm the Clerk and Treasurer for the City of Bamberg, South Carolina. The City of Bamberg, let me say, first of all, we support the GNEP initiative. As the City of Bamberg's Clerk and Treasurer I would like to voice my support and the support of the citizens I serve for the GNEP program and the siting of the facilities here in South Carolina. I can tell you without question that an overwhelming majority of the residents of South Carolina, particularly in Bamberg County, are eager to have South Carolina selected for this project. We know that nuclear energy is safe and cost-effective, and we realize the economic impact that such an international project would have on our communities. On behalf of our residents, we support the GNEP program and the facilities. On a personal note, nuclear warheads have kept us, as Americans, safe for years. Yes, we have them. So what do we do with them now? We turn them into jobs and into energy. Someone will have this duty. Why not South Carolina? As a proud American, I'm tired of depending on a bunch of camel jockeys in the Middle East to provide us, our country, with the majority of our energy needs. We must develop this alternative energy avenue. The GNEP initiative is just one of these avenues. Yes, we support it. On a further note again, I'd like to commend the Department of Energy, Department of Defense

for allowing me to maintain my status as a free American. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Isaiah Odom. Chris Noah will be next.

MR. ODOM: Good evening. It is my honor to speak tonight in favor of the GNEP project and to ask the Department of Energy to give South Carolina your highest consideration in selecting the site for the GNEP program and facility. As a member of Bamberg County Council and Board Member of the Southern Carolina Alliance, former employee of Savannah River Site of 10-plus years, pastor of a church in--Baptist church in Barnwell, South Carolina, for 35 years, I can attest to the fact that the project would have a positive impact on our economy and our people would welcome the job creation from the nuclear fuel processing plant. Our citizens welcome the GNEP project, and we hope that South Carolina is selected as the site for the GNEP program. Thank you very much.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Chris Noah, and Amy Marshall will be next.

MR. NOAH: Hi. My name is Chris Noah. I've got a doctorate in environmental policy and have administered an alternative energy grants program for 4 years, as part of my history. Alternative energy sources like wind, solar, biomass are often described as the answer

to the nation's energy needs. But you have to examine them closely. They make one feel good but they don't do the job. Over 35 years I've heard many suggestions to solve the energy dilemma, and some I even funded. Proposals which asked for funding that I've looked at were like greenhouses constructed from bubble wrap; ferris wheels made out of 50-gallon drums placed in the river; a dog-powered washing machine; and an airplane made out of cardboard, and the corrugation eliminated the drag, the author said. The reason I bring this up is that admittedly, alternative energy sources have come a long way over the years. But they are expensive, subsidized, and do not address the question of intense energy needs for cities or manufacturing areas. For these needs I see GNEP and its method of producing energy as the answer. Further, when you compare GNEP with the other energy alternatives, please don't go up the rabbit trail of net energy analysis. You'll hear stories about the cost of mining and trucking fuel, even the cost of commuting construction workers. If you do go into net energy analysis and go--if you do that, be fair and go back to the dirt of all energy sources. Study the actual costs of net energy from all sources. And in closing, when you look even at windmills, you will have you NIMBYs, as evidenced by the elites on Cape Cod who said wind farms

blocked their exclusive ocean views. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Amy Marshall. William Murphy would be followed by Shanna Barwick.

MR. MURPHY: Good evening. My name is William Murphy and I'm a member of the Carolinas Chapter of North American Young Generation of Nuclear, or NAYGN. As a concerned citizen of and an engineer-in-training licensed in the state of South Carolina, I am largely pleased with the environmental issues to be analyzed in the scope of the GNEP Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. Section 8 of DOE's Notice of Intent for the EIS lists the potential environmental issues for analysis. I am thoroughly impressed with the wide range of issues that DOE has proposed. What is especially significant is the proposed inclusion of potential impacts from acts of terrorism or sabotage. This issue, especially as it pertains to the nuclear power industry, has very recently made its way to the United States justice system. To see this item addressed in the GNEP Programmatic EIS will not only serve to abate the fears of environmental harm from an attack on GNEP's facilities, but it will also help to reduce the chance of litigation that may impede facility operations. Section 4 of DOE's Notice of Intent states that, and I quote, DOE should pursue and

analyze alternatives to nuclear power in PEIS. I disagree this item falls within the scope of the GNEP Programmatic EIS. As it is written this item serves as a referendum upon the institution of commercial nuclear power generation as a whole. As the GNEP Programmatic EIS is meant to discuss GNEP, I contend this item's scope should be narrowed to only alternatives to GNEP.

However, if the item is to be analyzed in the EIS, as is, then I propose a balancing addition to the EIS, that the consequences of not employing commercial nuclear power generation are analyzed as well. Section 2 of DOE's Notice of Intent states that the world's electricity consumption will double between 2003 and 2030. Without an increase in base-load nuclear generation I believe the EIS would conclude that the only realistic alternatives would be coal or natural gas-base generation, both of which are substantial carbon emitters. If GNEP's Programmatic EIS is to discuss alternatives to nuclear power as a whole, it should also discuss the consequences of such alternatives. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Shanna Barwick. William Small. Anne Rice. Eartha Rogers. William Pirkle. Good. And Lewis Patrie will follow William Pirkle. I'm sorry. Lewis Patrie.

MR. PIRKLE: I'm Bill Pirkle. I'm Director of the

Sponsored Research Office at USC Aiken. I have a letter from our Chancellor, Dr. Tom Hallman. It's addressed to Samuel Bodman, Secretary of Energy. The University of South Carolina Aiken fully supports the South Carolina site at Savannah River for the proposed nuclear fuel recycling center and the advanced recycling reactor being proposed for the GNEP facilities. This location of the GNEP facilities is good for the Central Savannah River Area, DOE and the United States. There are many advantages to DOE by locating the GNEP facilities in South Carolina. South Carolina and Georgia are in the heart of the nuclear-friendly Southeast. The GNEP facilities will be located in close proximity to its customer base. There are ample regional markets that exist for the electricity produced by the advanced recycle reactor.

The level of public and government support for DOE nuclear activities is second to none. The availability of a trained security and nuclear operations workforce, as well as supporting nuclear facilities and infrastructure, will save DOE significant cost and schedule in its construction and operation of the GNEP facilities. There are many advantages to Georgia and South Carolina by locating the GNEP facilities in South Carolina. The economic benefits are large with the tremendous investment in new construction and several



thousand needed jobs. Much of this investment could ultimately be on the tax roles. The advanced nuclear--the advanced fuel recycle--research facility provides a new major, long-term mission for the Savannah River National Laboratory. Over one half of South Carolina's electricity is produced in nuclear plants. GNEP will help assure a reliable, environmentally friendly and economic source of energy and provide a better method of managing spent nuclear fuel at in-state reactors. One of the region's important principles for SRS activities is that any nuclear waste brought into South Carolina for processing have an approved pathway out of South Carolina. The GNEP program--

MR. BROWN: Okay. You're at 2 minutes. If you can maybe submit the remainder for--

MR. PIRKLE: --meets that objective. This is ample basis for a binding agreement with DOE on this matter.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Lewis Patrie, and Gerald Rudolph will be next.

MR. PATRIE: I'm Dr. Lewis Patrie, the Chair of Western North Carolina Physicians for Social Responsibility. I live in Asheville, North Carolina, and came down for this event. How can you contend that this proposal will reduce nuclear waste when it does

just the opposite? How can our citizens be assured that their health and safety can be protected considering the 34 million gallons of highly radioactive material have already begun to contaminate groundwater and surface waters? How can we be assured that if foreign corporations are awarded contracts that the health and safety of our people will be protected?

How can we be assured that practices alleged to have been carried out by companies like OGEEMA [phonetic], which has reportedly discharged radioactive waste directly into the ocean, might not happen in our backyard? How can the risk of nuclear proliferation be relieved--be reduced when this proposal would offer countries--materials to countries like India which have developed nuclear weapons? This apparent violation of separation of nuclear weapons from the peaceful atom tells the rest of the world that our treaty commitments such as those offered by the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty are not trustworthy, that we practice do what we say, not what we do. Would not research and development of immobilization be a safer approach and would it not provide much more--much needed employment? Would not--would not adequate cleanup operations of sites like Savannah River Site be more desirable for health and future generations and also provide employment? Has the potential environmental impact been assessed?

And what protections have been assured to minority groups and low-income peoples living near SRS? How can we justify continued expansion of nuclear power and indefinite operations of existing reactors when nuclear power has never been able to pay for itself? There has been--have had one Chernobyl, one Three Mile Island, and several very close calls as well as accidents.

MR. BROWN: If you can just wrap--

MR. PATRIE: I'll finish. These have come very close to reeking disasters. How can we justify massive additional subsidies and programs promoting nuclear power when there will be a delay of 15 to 20 years before any new reactors would be able to produce any electricity? Conservation of energy is many times more cost-effective and we can--can be put into effect without delay. Renewable resources like solar and wind are being increasingly more and more cost-effective. These measures can provide long-lasting employment, no significant pollution and are not targets of terrorism. Conservation and renewables are not particularly disadvantaged--disadvantageous to the environment. In fact, these approaches offer a promising unlimited resource, the energy from the sun, and would not contribute to global warming. Have you thoroughly investigated--

MR. BROWN: If you can--

MR. PATRIE: --by going to such sources--

MR. BROWN: Can you make this your--

MR. PATRIE: --as Rocky Mountain Institute--

MR. BROWN: Gerard Rudolph is next. Lessie Price.

You don't need to run. Hi there. Good to see you.

Catherine Thomas will be next.

MS. PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be very brief. I am Lessie Price and I'm with Aiken City Council. And for the record I have five letters to submit. I'm not going to read the letters but summarize what's here. The letters are from Mayor Vernon Dunbar, the Mayor of the City of New Ellenton; from Aiken Regional Medical Centers, signed by K.D. Justyn, CEO and Managing Director; from the University Health Care Foundation President and CEO, Pete Brodie; from the National Management Association SRS Chapter President, Jeanette Brooks; and from the Medical University of South Carolina, David Rivers, Public Information and Community Outreach Director. Mr. Chairman, all the letters are stating that they are fully supportive of South Carolina as the proposed location for the proposed nuclear fuel recycling center and the advanced recycling reactor being proposed for the GNEP facilities. All the letters are also stating advantages to locating the GNEP facilities in South Carolina and it's addressed the saving aspect of it as

well. I'll submit this for the record.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Catherine Thomas, and Denice Traina has signed up next.

MS. THOMAS: I'm Catherine Thomas. I'm President Elect of the Southeast Environmental Management Association, and I'm just going to read a portion of a letter that we've written to the Secretary. The Southeast Environmental Management Association, known as SEMA, wishes to support the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, GNEP, which will, number one, increase U.S. and global security; reduce the risk of nuclear proliferation; encourage the development of clean energy around the world; reduce the amount of nuclear waste; and improve the environment. We also recommend locating the GNEP facilities in the Central Savannah River Area in South Carolina at the proposed Barnwell and Savannah River Site locales because GNEP facilities will be in close proximity to the customer base; ample regional markets exist for the electricity produced by the advanced recycling reactor; the level of public and governmental support for DOE nuclear activities in the CSRA is unsurpassed; the availability of a trained security and nuclear operations workforce as well as supporting nuclear facilities and infrastructure will provide DOE significant cost and scheduling savings associated with the construction and operation of GNEP

facilities; and the proposed CSRA locales offer large size and secure boundaries for security and also enhance continuity of operations. Do I have more time?

MR. BROWN: You do.

MS. THOMAS: Okay. Additional reasons for locating the GNEP in the CSRA include: the CSRA has been demonstrated as acceptable for development of reactors and facilities for recycling nuclear fuel; one of the region's important principles is that any nuclear waste products brought into South Carolina for processing have an approved pathway out of South Carolina. The GNEP program meets this objective because spent nuclear fuel brought into the state for processing as part of the GNEP program will have pathways out of the state either as new fuel back to nuclear power reactors or as high level waste for disposal in the national repository. There is ample basis for a binding agreement with DOE on the aforementioned matter, which will facilitate deployment of the GNEP to South Carolina. In summary, SEMA strongly supports Complex 2030 and the Consolidated Plutonium Center project and recommends that it be located in the Central Savannah River Area of South Carolina. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Denise.

MS. TRAINA: Good evening. As a member of the

Executive Committee of the Georgia Green Party, I come to you with grave concerns about the GNEP reprocessing mission. The tons of plutonium that will be produced as a result of this project pose an unnecessary risk to our community, and I mean our community at large. Very large, since we know that our air, water and soil can be affected by any accident that may occur and that these effects will be felt miles and miles from us. Our priorities to create clean, safe energy solutions should take us down a path that includes solar, wind, and agricultural solutions such as switch grass. With the Green Party's reputation of being the party of peace and environmental wisdom, we encourage this body to be wise when they consider the consequences of this mission. The Georgia Green Party is absolutely opposed to the GNEP plan. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. We are now running 40 minutes overtime. We've have one person sign up that would like to speak again, and I'm presuming that this is a vital statement. I think it's fair to the audience that if one person speaks again that we ought to give other folks a chance to do the same. But I would encourage people to be--

MR. CHAPUT: What I have is--

MR. BROWN: --short--

MR. CHAPUT: I have two letters that people asked

me to present for them.

MR. BROWN: Okay. That's--

MR. CHAPUT: It's not my--

MR. BROWN: That's marginally acceptable.

MR. CHAPUT: Okay. I do have two letters here.

The first is to Mr. Dennis Spurgeon from Wayne Rogers, who is the Executive Director of the Lower Savannah Council of Governments. It doesn't say anything in addition to what's been said so far. I will just submit that directly to the record. The second letter is from Dr. Paul Bertsch, who is Director and Professor of the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory at the University of Georgia addressed to the Secretary. There's some new thoughts in here that I think--just briefly summarize. He says: I am writing from the perspective of an environmental scientist. He talks about the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory has been studying the effects of DOE's nuclear production and processing facilities on the environment at Savannah River for over 50 years. They've been able to differentiate the impacts from off-site activities, onsite activities and those that naturally occur. Conclusions: our research has demonstrated that the health of SRS ecosystems overall is very good and better than if the 310 square mile reservation had not been protected as a result of DOE's long-term missions



at the Savannah River Site. He would welcome the opportunity to provide independent assessments on the GNEP facilities. And he believes that the co-location at Savannah River Site makes good environmental sense and Savannah River is a good location for GNEP. They routinely share the results of their environmental studies with peers and no other site in his opinion or to his knowledge has an independent university lab to provide such an oversight role. And these are important considerations. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. That concludes the statements by folks who signed up. We've gone into a bit of overtime, I appreciate everybody's participation. Please note that you may continue to submit comments on the scope of the PEIS until the comment period closes on April 4th. The printed materials that were handed out to you indicate the various ways in which you can submit comments. So please do that. And, again, I appreciate your participation, your comments, and gentility. And we are adjourned.

[Meeting adjourns at 9:44 p.m.]

//  
//  
//  
//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript consisting of pages numbered 3 through 224 is a true and correct transcript of the proceeding held before me; that said hearing was reported by the method of Stenomask.

I further certify that I am not kin or counsel to the parties, am not in the regular employ of counsel or said parties, nor am I otherwise interested in the result of the proposed action.

This the 16<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2007.

---

ANDREA L. GREGORY, CCR

CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

GEORGIA CERTIFICATE # B-1720